DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 351 PS 007 856

AUTHOR Heyneman, Stephen P.
TITLE Toward Interagency Coordination: An Overview of FY '74 Federal Research and Development Activities Relating to Adolescence. Second Annual Report.
INSTITUTION George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Social Research Group.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.; Interagency Panel on Early Childhood Research and Development, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Dec 74
NOTE 183p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$9.51 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescence; Agency Role; Demonstration Projects; *Federal Programs; Financial Support; *Interagency Coordination; Policy Formation; Research Methodology; Research Needs; *Research Projects; Social Agencies; Statistical Surveys; *Youth Agencies

ABSTRACT

This report provides an overview of fiscal year 1974 federal and agency research and development activities related to adolescence and summarizes the work done by the Interagency Panel on Adolescence. The purpose of the report is to identify, with empirical authority research gaps and overlaps in currently funded projects. Cataloging and listing of currently-funded projects provides a complete interinstitutional compilation of projects funded. The report is divided into four parts: (1) Special Interest Activities of the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adolescence 1973/74; (2) Commonalities in Calls for Policy on Adolescence 1973/74; (3) Patterns of Federal Research on Adolescence in FY '74; and (4) Patterns of Agency Research and Development on Adolescence: Their Missions, Activity in FY '74 and Levels of Interest for FY '75. The appendixes contain agency plans for research and development in FY '75, guidelines and procedures for using the Interagency Panel Information System, a list of documents prepared for Interagency Panels on Early Childhood and Adolescence, and a list of the Adolescence Panel membership. (CS)

ED107351

TOWARD INTERAGENCY COORDINATION:

An Overview of FY '74 Federal Research and Development Activities Relating to Adolescence

Second Annual Report

Prepared for
The Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adolescence
Edith H. Grotberg, Ph.D., Chairperson

By

Stephen P. Heyneman

Social Research Group
The George Washington University
Washington, D.C.

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract HEW-100-75-0010 with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

December 1974

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PS 007 856

2/3

Participating Member Agencies of the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adolescence

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (DHEW)

- Office of Human Development (OHD)
- Office of Child Development (OCD)
- Office of Youth Development (OYD)
- Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE)
- National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH)
- National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke (NINDS)
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD)
- Bureau of Community Health Services (BCHS)
- Social and Rehabilitation Service (SRS)
- Office of Education (OE)
- National Institute of Education (NIE)
- Office of Civil Rights (OCR)

Department of Agriculture (USDA)

Department of Labor (DOL)

ACTION

Office of Management and Budget (OMB)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writing of this report could never have been accomplished without the substantive assistance from individuals at the Social Research Group and within the Federal agencies. Most helpful guidance was provided by Edith H. Grotberg, the Chairperson of the Panel on Adolescence, and Maure Hurt, Jr., the Project's Director, as well as my colleague Thomas Hertz. In addition, however, I think it essential to acknowledge the groundwork laid on the classification system by Adele Harrell and my predecessor, Ellen Searcy; the time and energy spent by the research assistants Ada Jo Mann and Sharon Mangus in their talented coding and computing; the computer caretaking skills of Ronald Ouellet; the helpful editing of Judy Miller; and the gracious, good-natured flexibility toward alterations by Linda Bley, whose typing skills exceed all those I have ever seen before.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION: THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE INTERAGENCY PANEL FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ON ADOLESCENCE................ 1

I. SPECIAL INTEREST ACTIVITIES OF THE INTERAGENCY PANEL FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ON ADOLESCENCE 1973/1974............... 7

Marker Variables and Marker Measures...................... 7

The Special Interest Group on Work Experience............. 11

Content and Implications of Work Experience Activities: Presentations by Representatives of Federal Agencies, December, 1973.. 15

Presentations of Developments in Research on Adolescence --The "Experimenting" School............................. 22

Presentations of Developments in Research on Adolescence --The Boys' Town Centers................................. 24

II. COMMONALITIES IN CALLS FOR POLICY ON ADOLESCENCE 1973/1974...... 29

The Tenor of Past Efforts................................. 29

The Tenor of Recent Suggestions for Policy on Adolescence.. 34

III. PATTERNS OF FEDERAL RESEARCH ON ADOLESCENCE IN FY '74.......... 43

Methodological Concerns................................... 43

Patterns of Total Federal Research Activity on Children and Adolescents in FY '74.................................. 46

Patterns of Federal Research Activity on Adolescent Target Groups in FY '74.. 53

Patterns of Federal Adolescent Research and Development Activity with Respect to Project Focus........................ 59

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

Page

IV. PATTERNS OF AGENCY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ON ADOLESCENCE: THEIR MISSIONS, ACTIVITY IN FY '74 AND LEVELS OF INTEREST FOR FY '75 75

- Office of Youth Development 76
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development ... 80
- National Institute of Mental Health 84
- National Institute of Drug Abuse 88
- National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism 92
- National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke 96
- Bureau of Community Health Services 99
- Social and Rehabilitation Service 103
- National Institute of Education 106
- Office of Child Development 110
- Office of Education (OPBE, BOAE, BEH, OIE, Right-To-Read, BSS) 114
- Department of Agriculture 142
- Department of Labor 146
- ACTION 150

APPENDICES

A. Agency Plans for Adolescence Research and Development in FY '74. 155

B. Guidelines and Procedures for Use of Interagency Panel Information System 167

C. Documents Prepared for Interagency Panels on Early Childhood and Adolescence Research and Development 173

D. Adolescence Panel Membership List 179

BIBLIOGRAPHY 185

INTRODUCTION

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE INTERAGENCY PANEL FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN ADOLESCENCE

In a complex industrial democracy such as the United States, it is normal for differing governmental agencies, while addressing identical populations, to fulfill specialized needs. So it is with children. In all, more than four departments and two dozen agencies in one way or another sponsor research or melioristic programs which have as their ultimate goal the improvement of a child's life. This is to be expected. It is also natural to find the interests of these agencies overlapping. Conservatively interpreted, one should not be surprised to find as many as half a dozen agencies actively supporting activity on such subjects as improper nutrition and child development, or parental interaction and social deviancy. In a broader sense, one should not be surprised to find a large number of additional agencies which deal in their own ways with children and would directly benefit from having efficient access to the most recent discoveries in these two areas.

It was within this context that Secretary Robert Finch of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare directed Edward Zigler, the Director of the Office of Child Development and of the Children's Bureau, to gather the most senior individuals from every agency in the Federal structure who had, within their purview, the interest of research and development on American children. This was a considerable undertaking, yet despite the fact that often bureaucracies do not benefit their own organization from shared activities, the participation on the Interagency Panel on Early Childhood Research and Development right from its inception in 1970 virtually encompassed the whole breadth of the Federal structure and was represented by its most highly responsible research and development policy personnel.

Within a year of its first meeting, and after a National Institute of Child Health and Human Development survey, it became obvious to the Panel members that the Federal government was supporting comparatively little work in the age range of adolescence. It was decided in 1972 to form a separate Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adolescence which was to concentrate on that age period. The fact that militancy and disenchantment of American adolescents in the late 1960's and early 1970's was receiving considerable public attention was not in any way irrelevant to the speed and purposefulness which surrounded the first meeting represented by 15 Federal agencies in the fall of 1972.

There have been numerous interagency panels established at one time or another in Washington. Most have had a low rate of survival due to conflicting demands on the time of the agency representatives. However, the Interagency Panel on Early Childhood and the Interagency Panel on Adolescence have not only had a good record in terms of their work's quality,[1] but also have a healthy prognosis in terms of their future livelihood. There are several valid structural reasons for the latter. First, according to Dr. Maure Hurt, the Information Secretariat within the OCD which contracts with the Social Research Group supplies a special "hardiness" to the two Interagency Panels by supplying administration, research and a unique bank of data on all currently-funded project grants. Because the Social Research Group's (SRG) data is capable of delineating individual agency opinions, plotting trends right across agencies and mediating over vastly disparate interests, the SRG has given the Panels a strong organizational back-up and has therefore injected the Panels with a degree of vitality uncommon to other interagency efforts.

A second strength and reason for the durability of the two Panels is their subject matter. Though subjected to the same trends, fads, and normal policy shifts as other Federally sponsored efforts, the basic area of research on children is of enduring interest to a wide variety of professional specialties and political administrations.[2] The efficient coordination of that effort, which is the job entrusted to the two Panels, is seen as being as enduring as the effort itself--that of understanding and of improving the lives of children.

---

[1] A list of publications prepared for the Interagency Panels by the Social Research Group appears in Appendix C.

[2] "Political" here means the normal shifting in emphasis accruing from any change of personnel either in the White House or in Congress.

Support Functions of the Social Research Group

As the supporting arm for both Interagency Panels, the Social Research Group fulfills a number of functions; these can be divided between those which are manifest and those, no less substantial, which are latent. Of primary and manifest importance is the gathering of what is referred to as the "Information System." This "system" is a core raison d'etre of both Panels. It consists of all the possible information which can be garnered from the individual project proposals across virtually all Federal agencies which fund research involving children or adolescents. The procedures for gathering the information are described below in more detail under the section entitled, "Methodological Procedures." What is sufficient to understand at this point is that the data do not constitute a sample, but an attempt to collect a complete universe of information describing every current Federally-funded research or development project which in some way involves children or adolescents.

There are four additional ways in which the Social Research Group manifests support for the two Interagency Panels besides collecting the information for the information system. Administrative Services are provided by the staff of the Social Research Group for all Panel activities, meetings, and inter-communications. In addition, the staff is often called upon to write papers involving detailed analysis of research on specific subjects which would span interests across agencies. This Research Function is a crucial professional responsibility for the Social Research Group. It can also involve conference presentations on behalf of the Panels, library research studies, and reports of on-site visits to demonstration projects.

Each year the Panels define for themselves and then pursue one or several topics of extraordinary interest. The Interagency Panel on Research and Development in Early Childhood, for example, has focused upon questions of longitudinal research, "home-focused" programs, marker variables, and the state of the family in present day society. The Interagency Panel on Research and Development in Adolescence, though younger by almost two years, has managed to find sufficient time to schedule specific meetings on the expansion of theory in adolescent development, work experience, a model of Experimenting Schools, and the plans for the newly founded Boys' Town research centers in Omaha, and at Stanford and Catholic Universities. The Social Research Group serves these Interagency special interests by helping to plan their development, organizing the logistics for their meetings, and by evaluating their outcomes.

Lastly, the Social Research Group staff annually prepares the annual reports on behalf of the Early Childhood and Adolescent Interagency Panels. The report is a major function for it is a summary, not only of the Interagency Panel activities, but of all the details of Federal research for the current fiscal year. The annual report is potentially the most inclusive document of its kind because it is assigned the task of displaying the distribution of research support right across Federal agencies and specifying both target populations and project contents.

However, in addition to these activities which are manifested under HEW Contract No. 100-75-0010, there exists an abundance of more latent functions of the Interagency Panels and their supporting staff. By virtue of the fact that the Panels function across agencies and are supported by representatives at the highest policy-making levels in the research and evaluation branches, the Panels can count upon participation of the highest quality. This, in turn, provides a proper forum where generalities can be perceived with both clarity and consistency. Firstly, the Panels are in a strategically exclusive position to identify research gaps by being able to state, with empirical authority, how much effort is presently being placed on any given question. This same authority would apply to the Panel's ability to identify over-laps in research efforts which could have, heretofore, gone unnoticed. Secondly, the cataloguing and listing of every currently-funded project every year has the effect of providing a complete inter-institutional memory on what was funded, to whom, where, and for what purpose. Because it is more common for published projects to be those which happen to "succeed," and because funding information is otherwise scattered among numerous agencies, the data of the Interagency Panels provide a history not only of those funded projects which may never obtain their objectives and perhaps never reach publication, but catalogues these projects at one central location with facile access to professional institutions or to interested researchers. In short, these Panels provide a substantially unique function for inter-communication between individual investigators, universities, research foundations, state and local agencies, and all agencies of the Federal government actively engaged in researching ways to benefit the lives of children and adolescents.

2

CHAPTER I

SPECIAL INTEREST ACTIVITIES OF THE INTERAGENCY PANEL FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ON ADOLESCENCE 1973/1974

Section 1: Marker Variables and Marker Measures

One method of plotting the interests of a committee is to re-read the minutes of its previous meetings. In this regard, one could safely say that the Interagency Panel on Adolescence has demonstrated over the last year a consistent interest in the theoretical and policy implications of marker variables and marker measures. Some amount of time at virtually every meeting was spent in a discussion over the theory of "marker" concepts, the developments within particular agencies surrounding marker policies, and the presentations by Panel members on both subjects at meetings of professional associations.

For example, three formal papers on marker variables and marker measures were presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association in New Orleans on behalf of the Interagency Panels. They were entitled: (1) "A Progress Report on Developing Comparability in Research," by Maure Hurt, Jr. of the Social Research Group; (2) "Societal Change and the Rate of Research Progress," by Richard Bell of the Department of Psychology, University of Virginia[1] and Thomas Hertz of the Social Research Group; and (3) "In Furtherance of Cululative Knowledge: Some NIMH Initiatives," by David Pearl, Chief of the Behavioral Sciences Branch of the National Institute of Mental Health. The concept of marker variables was introduced and summarized by the moderator, Edith Grotberg from the Office of Child Development and Chairperson of the Interagency Panels on Adolescence and Early Childhood.

---

[1] Dr. Bell retired as Chief of the Child Research Branch, NIMH, as of August 31, 1974, and has been active with the Social Research Group before beginning his appointment at the University of Virginia.

That some agreement upon marker variables is a necessary ingredient for insuring inter-study comparability was a central theme of all the discussions. Federal agencies, funding in excess of three thousand independent research studies on children in the last fiscal year alone, have perceived a need for interagency guidelines which would insure an increment in the comparability of data and conclusions without sacrificing either the investigator's independence or his creativity.

A second theme has been a detailing of the ample precedents for cooperation which have been established within the professional research communities themselves. Bell and Hertz, for example, described the 1951 and 1958 Educational Testing Service conferences on factor analysis which led to wide agreement on those cognitive factors which were testable at acceptable levels of purity. They also cited the 1960 inaugural meeting of the Association of the Psychophysiological Study of Sleep which, prompted by the plethora of scoring criteria for stages of sleep, led eventually to an agreed-upon standard scoring system.

David Pearl added three additional precedents of cooperative marker variable activity. He said that primatologists have gathered their combined experiences into an atlas which enumerates categories and techniques of primate observation. In addition, the neuropsychology of aggression has been aided by a new handbook detailing appropriate research techniques which were agreed upon at a recent conference. And lastly, what Pearl described as "semantic slipperiness" in measures of locus of control is expected to be rectified somewhat by the concensus resulting from a March workshop sponsored by the National Institute of Mental Health. Two, or perhaps three additional locus of control workshops are in the planning stages, which should, by mutual agreement, develop a variety of what Pearl called, "common protocols."

As a caution to those who might justifiably feel uneasy about the need for government to consider content across disparate arenas of research, some pains have been taken in the Panel discussions to describe the definitional limits of marker concepts as well as the cautious processes necessary before one could arrive near a stage for policy. For example, it seemed generally agreed that there were four marker concepts which could be kept definitionally distinct: (1) variables; (2) measures; (3) core; and (4) background. They could be conceived as in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1

CATEGORIES OF MARKER CONCEPTS:
A FOUR CELL MODEL

	CORE	BACKGROUND
VARIABLES	XXXX	(I)
MEASURES	XXXX	(II)

In this model, marker variables could be thought of as key measurable concepts. Marker measures would be specific indices of those concepts. Background measures or background variables would be those which are not of primary concern to the principal investigator; while core variables and core measures are those which are of primary concern.[2]

Two assumptions seemed germane to the cautionary discussion of Federal interest in the area of marker concepts. First, no policy would be conceived which would prescribe either core measures or core variables across agencies. These two would remain the prerogative of the principal investigator in conjunction with the sponsoring funding agency. Second, identification and agreement upon specific background marker variables (I) would have to be prerequisite to a discussion of specific background marker measures (II).

Thus, there were three categories of marker concepts which appeared beyond the scope of preliminary discussion and the most important attention was therefore focused upon the upper right hand cell--that of background marker variables. This category could be thought of as containing those key measurable concepts which are to be used as potential controls of independent variables, not only for the purpose of inter-study comparability, but for the maintenance of minimum research quality between agencies with differing arenas of technical expertise.

---

[2] In addition, there are potentially two additional issues within the subject of research comparison; those involving (1) definitional and (2) methodological commonalities.

An additional reason was given by Bell and Hertz to justify the Federal government playing what Pearl described as a "catalytic" role in the encouragement of marker concept thinking. They have argued that there exists the possibility in areas of study like socialization norms that societal patterns could change at a rate faster than that of research within its normal "market place." In other words, by the time investigators had pioneered their independent studies, had argued and had coordinated their terminological incompatabilities, and had restudied those areas where variables had been left uncontrolled, the society would already have altered sufficiently to invalidate the resulting agreed-upon generalizations.

They argued that this "self-correcting" market place interaction is slow, inefficient, and also uncertain due to the fact that editors and peer review committees customarily deal with single studies independently. Because the most common model for publication and dissemination has been a study which could stand and be evaluated independently by the reviewer, they argued that there was less demand than there should be for studies to be linked within a specified continuum of research variables.

In response to the interest expressed by both Interagency Panels, Edith Grotberg, the Chairperson, sent a letter on July 18th to all heads of Federal agencies funding research on children. The letter was titled: "Recommended Actions for Increasing Comparability of Research Findings: Marker Variables and Marker Measures." In the letter, Dr. Grotberg cited the generalized concern over the need for comparability expressed by the Panel's representatives, noted the cautionary procedures the Federal government should be aware of, but then outlined three guidelines for proposed research to which the agencies might address themselves. The first involved definitional commonalities, the second included suggestions for minimal sample descriptions, while the third explored the possibility of having the investigators review their study's relationship to other studies.

In addition to soliciting responses from the heads of agencies, the Interagency Panels hosted a day-long conference for 13 editors of social science journals on November 4th. The central purpose of the conference was to query the editors on their experience in assuring inter-study comparability, and to elicit their suggestions with respect to recommended policies in the future. In addition, the meeting served to familiarize the editors with governmental thinking and to inaugurate their future cooperation. A second conference with a similar purpose is planned for the spring of 1975 with a representation of deans of graduate schools.

The Panel activities this year are illustrative of the most up-to-date explications of marker variable thinking. However, it was generally agreed that before settling upon an overall policy, specific background marker variables first have to be input from the field, thought out, and coordinated in settings like the American Psychological Association meetings and the editor and graduate school dean conferences. These are the arenas which are the most conducive to receiving a wide variety of professional experience and provide the most meaningful forum for substantive exchanges.

Section 2: The Special Interest Groups on Work Experience

In the spring of 1973, a report was prepared by Ellen Searcy of the Social Research Group mapping the activities of Federal agencies in the fields of job-training and career educational programs (Searcy, 1973). Speaking to the interests of the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adolescence, the report described a variety of current research issues and findings, and submitted a number of recommendations for future research directions.

After discussing the paper at the July meeting, the Panel on Adolescence thought it would be valuable to further pursue the theme in a Special Interest Group on Work Experience. Two meetings of the Special Interest Group were planned: an initial session in which participants could discuss theoretical overviews of adolescence, and a second session in which Panel members who represented agencies directly involved in work experience projects could discuss the content and implications of their activities.

Subsequently, the first meeting of the Special Interest Group was held on September 28th, in which Dr. John P. Hill, Chairperson of the Department of Human Development and Family Studies, Cornell University, and Dr. Robert

Grinder, Associate Dean of the College of Education, Arizona State University, were invited to present theoretical overviews of development as related to work experience. Their presentations and the substantive discussion following, laid the foundation for a second meeting held on December 17th at which four representatives discussed in detail the problems and prospects of the work experience activities of their respective agencies. The four representatives presenting formal discussions were: Mr. Eugene V. Martin, Director of the School-to-Work Project at the National Council on Vocational Education, Dr. Glen C. Boerrigter of the Office of Education, Vocational Education Research Program, Mr. Charles Stalford, Career Education Program, National Institute of Education, and Dr. Harry Lieberman from the Office of Research and Development, Department of Labor. The following is a short summary of the presentations and discussions at these two meetings.

Theoretical Overviews of Adolescence

With a field of interest such as adolescence, which has been approached by every conceivable discipline, Dr. Grinder and Dr. Hill's task of presenting an organized summary was a formidable one. Understanding the necessity of omission due to time considerations, they nevertheless managed to inject a range of scholarship from the social sciences into their discussions: from anthropoligists Margaret Mead and educator A. S. Neil, to sociologists Talcott Parsons and James Coleman and psychologists G. Stanley Hall, Jerome Brunner, Arnold Gesell, Erik Erickson, and H. S. Sullivan. However, being psychologists, both Hill and Grinder, perhaps, felt more comfortable choosing to emphasize psychological viewpoints.

Though both Hill and Grinder had spent a substantial portion of their careers studying youths, neither held that there were fully developed theories for that age range as there were for the age range of early childhood. Grinder mentioned that there were cognitive or physical or social models of adolescence, but emphasized that "rather than being a developmental stage of invariant proportions, adolescence is a product--created, molded, and made partly by an ever-changing society. Indeed, adolescence is a social institution of recent origin."

Among many, two sources figured most prominently: an article by Lawrence Kohlberg and Rochell Mayer in the Harvard Educational Review of 1972, entitled: "Development as the Aim of Education," and the model of cognitive development presented in the theories of the Swiss psychologist, Jean Piaget.[3]

Besides the general discussions of Kohlberg's moral development and Piagetian formal operations, there were a number of ideas of substantive importance for the Panel on Adolescence. First, when conceptualizing the age range of adolescence, both psychologists emphasized that it should never be thought of in terms which would isolate it either from post or pre-adolescence experience. Secondly, both presentations rested on the issue of "body type" and "body image" as playing a key role in understanding how children develop motivations such as aspirations, expectations, career interests, and self-concepts. It was argued that because society often has the effect of presenting an ideal body type for both males and females, deviation from it could trigger feelings which would engender a number of personal handicaps.

Thirdly, there was a common concern over adolescent "sex roles." It was argued that both boys and girls are unavoidably affected by the emphasis which society and individual parents ascribe to particular genders. In addition to influencing a child's achievement attitudes generally, the cultural stereotypes of masculinity and femininity were seen as directly affecting a child's classification for potential occupations.

Fourthly, Grinder emphasized to the Panel the numerous legal contradictions which lay within the adolescence period. He held that in fact, adolescence was simply a way of labeling a period of life created by universal and compulsory schooling, child labor laws, and special legal procedures for "juveniles." To understand adolescence, he argued, one might first approach those societal forces which mold the complex special relationships to these child/adults. For example, adolescent uncertainty might become more clear if one thinks of all the contradictory milestones in becoming an adult (permission to drive at 16, vote at 18, drink at 21, etc.) and the traditional religious and ethnic rites de passage.

---

[3] Their evaluations of these authors have been summarized in more detail in Stephen P. Heyneman, "Adolescent Theories and Federal Career Education Programs: Needs and Gaps in Research," Social Research Group, September, 1974 [mimeographed].

On the other hand, Hill suggested that as a society, we tended to perceive the period of adolescence in stereotypic and negative terms. Adolescence is commonly characterized as a period of sexual confusion, social disorientation, hostility toward structural authority, and overconformity toward peers. These occurrences, he said, are not only not universal but in fact the period of adolescence may typically involve opposite phenomena. For example, he said that with the onset of instrumental competence, development studies show that peer conformity declines during the period of adolescence--exactly the opposite of the popular stereotype. Nor is it at all clear that adolescence typically involves hostility or rebellion against one's parents. In fact, Hill suggested that where rebellion does occur, it may be a function of "rather extreme parenting styles ... excessive permissiveness or authoritarian kinds of styles" and not at all an outgrowth of a maturing adolescent himself. Further stereotypes of adolescence were challenged when Hill suggested that the sexual confusion which is popularly noted as a force of major substance in adolescents, may only be peripherally relevant. What is central to adolescent unease is the search, not the sexual experience, but the search for intimate experience--a very different need. He said that it is the latter and not the former which should be conceived as typically influential to adolescent development.

Lastly, Hill and Grinder disagreed on one point, but it symbolizes something so important for all Federal approaches to research on adolescence, that it bears mention here. Grinder's view of societal/moral/cultural parameters was mentioned above in his rejection of the Kohlberg and Mayer synthesis model. He held that all societies, ours included, contained melioristic qualities germane to their structure. These qualities helped the individual by offering him ready-made "organization, stability, and consistency," which "frees the individual for truly creative enterprise."

In contrast, Hill viewed society as without universal leadership direction, as representing a myriad of contradictory mores capable only of moral disorientation. "In our society," he said,

> there are no clear universal expectations for what one should be or do when one reaches puberty ... the adolescent is faced with a mass of heterogenous kinds of expectations and is rewarded for being so many different things that the choices are not really options; they are obstacles.

This difference in orientation is fundamental; it conceives antipodal realities between what society is, and what it needs. One views society as providing stable and therapeutic influences, a second as providing only contradictory and dysfunctional lessons. The latter would imply a wider latitude of expectations and assumptions for institutional response in dealing with adolescence. The contradiction lies at the core of different, and often competitive perceptions of research priorities and hypotheses, and the role of the Federal government. Along with the very capable and specific summaries of adolescent theory, this disagreement provided the gathered policy-makers with a clear demonstration of the divergencies within the very exclusive community of academic scientists from which they must draw their theoretical support for active programs.

Section 3: Content and Implications of Work Experience Activities: Presentations by Representatives of Federal Agencies, December 1973

Those with close day-to-day experience with the problems of improving career selection among adolescents could not help but reflect on the distinctions between the academic-theoretical and the governmental-melioristic orientations. The two groups, by necessity, focus upon different realities. For example, Eugene Martin from the National Advisory Council For Vocational Education somewhat pessimistically mentioned that as he listened to the psychologists describe the age when young people become capable of formal operations and obtain the ability to perceive a given situation as only one of a variety of alternatives, he wondered how often formal operations were experienced by the adult educationalists with whom he had daily contact. And though Charles Stalford of the National Institute of Education (NIE) reported that as a result of NIE's research, it was found that 80% of the parents wanted the school to teach "job skills" over such things as "academic knowledge" or "respect for authority," contrary theories still reigned as to how (or even whether) to go about it. How can research lead us, inferred Martin, when the efforts at finding a path are scattered and segmentary. He compared it to a situation in which we are all together in a big hole, each of us equipped with a pencil flashlight and charged with the responsibility of mapping its contours. All of the efforts seem uncoordinated; they shed light only for a moment, and only in the smallest of areas.

Martin and Stalford were not alone in mentioning stumbling blocks to implementing effective career education programs. Similar thoughts were expressed by Glen Boerrigter of the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (BOAE) and Harry Lieberman of the Department of Labor (DOL). For example, all four mentioned the very serious problems of working around employment legislation, labor unions, and licensing boards in vocational training and career experience education efforts. "The incidence of law suits against schools is increasing at an extremely rapid rate," said Boerrigter, "and therefore some schools do not go into work education experience programs because they think they might be violating the law."

"The subject of institutional change in unions," lamented Stalford, "is one which really baffles us ...." Lieberman cited a study from the Educational Testing Service which showed that the boards which license applicants to particular occupations and which govern those occupations "apply a great deal of discriminating factors." In reacting to the Educational Testing Service study, Lieberman described how he could recall when he had been ...

> a counselor for a number of years, discussing with a young man work that I thought would interest him. He did some very good woodshop work; I asked him if he'd considered apprenticeships in this area. He said, 'You must be crazy.' I asked him why he talked like that, and he replied that his father was not a carpenter. He said if you go down to the union looking for a unionized job and you want to become an apprentice, you find they have about 44 applicants for every three vacancies. The guy whose father is in the job is going to get the apprenticeship. Of course it didn't take me long to realize that the situation was like this in a number of places.

It became clear that the problems of licensing boards, employment legislation, and union interests are issues of such complexity that no career or vocational education program can succeed without at least cognizance and partial solutions to them. But these were not the only problems mentioned. All four participating agency representatives mourned the lack of sophisticated statistical or methodological controls in many of the studies at their disposal, a lack which seemed to seriously hamper the rationales for making decisions in program funding.

Boerrigter, for example, cited an evaluation of over 500 work-experience programs which listed numerous positive outcomes resulting to program graduates (high rates of responsibility, satisfying jobs, etc.) but which neglected to control for the initial selection of candidates into the work experience programs. "Cooperative programs," said Boerrigter, "tended to select those kinds of students who have the positive attitudes that will be accepted by the employers ... I think it was ... actually selecting the students who had the right attitude to begin with." Because many evaluations do not include precisely defined control groups, evaluations can avoid empirical rationales and become simply internal justifications, or what Boerrigter labeled as "program-oriented" research.

Other methodological gaps were cited as well. Boerrigter mentioned the fact raised by one of his colleagues that in 1972, of the 558,000 students completing vocational education, only 53.2% were really available for employment--a question that was very often not included in placement evaluation efforts.

Perhaps in not borrowing from the better defined areas within psychology, vocational evaluations often use what Boerrigter called "superficial terminology" in the area of motivation. "The terms are not identified," he said, "nor do we know what they mean."

The demand for more precise definition among complex influences is what seemed to have led the National Advisory Council For Vocational Education to phase their research goals in a format which lends itself to analysis of variance techniques. For example, when Martin mentioned that schools fail to extend their placement services to all students, he implied that the key to understanding that fact was more complex than simply providing more and better training programs. He said,

> We've addressed the issue of whether or not a school can place its students, we've been compelled to look at the whole sequence of psychological events by which people make vocational choices (or fail to make vocational choices) and begin to have a sense

> of how to move into the world of work, or the labor market ... there is the issue of whether or not jobs really exist and there are the economic and other aspects of reality to be considered. For example, does a student fail to get a job because there is no job or because the educational system was at fault or because the individual was at fault or because the employer is influenced by any number of discriminating conceptions about the individual's capability--the student is the wrong race, the wrong sex, the wrong age, what have you. We're concerned ... with a whole variety of changes at the same time.

Also disheartening were the facts presented by Stalford: When careful studies have been conducted into the relationship between spending money on schools and the resulting economic benefits (private or social), the results have appeared equivocal, or even negative. "One relatively obvious and accepted conclusion," Stalford said,

> is that, for example, vocational graduates do better 1 - 2 years after school but over 5, 10, 15 years that influence diminishes .... Time discounted income gains associated with increased educational spending are smaller than the requisite spending increase.

Lastly, a very fundamental issue was raised both by Stalford at the December 19th meeting and by Dr. Ramon Garcia from the Office of Child Development in the discussion of September 28th. Pointing to those factors which limit all institutions in accomplishing career education goals, Stalford mentioned the fact that school guidance counseling often stereotyped information (sex and/or achievement levels), and did a "disservice" by promoting the feeling that the role of the college may be dysfunctional, i.e., some children shouldn't go. Though career educational programs were supposed to "meet the needs" of the student and help settle him or her on an agreeable vocational endeavor, Dr. Garcia held that, in practice, intervention to help students find a place in society might cause adolescents to put a ceiling on their aspirations and prevent them from reaching goals which were actually attainable. Derived from the extensive experience of these two men, this point directed itself right at the central assumptions surrounding both work experiences and vocational training programs and will deserve to be dealt with seriously in future research efforts evaluating programmatic outcomes.

Gaps in Research

Of all the exchanges at the two meetings, among the most productive were those which successfully identified strategic "gaps" in research in areas relating to work experience and career education. Three types of gaps could be identified: those which would require an investigation of a specific hypothesized relationship between two well-defined variables; previously investigated areas which would require an approach via a new methodology; and thirdly, an area which was so undefined as to warrant a major effort, pursuing a variety of hypotheses and methodological approaches.

Relationships Between Specific Variables. Hill noted that though females, on the average, reach puberty two years before males, no evidence could be found which suggested any difference in the onset of formal operations. The question to be pursued, then, would be what relationship there might be, if any, between physical maturity and the capacity for formal operations.

With regard to adolescent rebellion and detachment,[4] Hill noted that they may be related to extreme permissiveness or strictness, and/or the heightened affective behavior known to be present in smaller families. It would be of considerable value to have specific data on the relationship between these two former dependent and three latter independent variables.

Though it has been common to assume that sex-role behavior in early childhood will influence later behavior in the adolescent period, and though the onset, nature, and frequency of adolescent sexual behavior have been assumed to be predicated on one's experience in early childhood, in fact, insufficient data has existed to draw the conclusion.

Numerous studies have investigated the relationship between academic achievement in schools and later job attainment. This profusion could be accounted for by the fact that job attainment has been easily categorized in a standard manner and then quantified. Similar data relating school performance with on-the-job performance has been seriously lacking--perhaps because job performance has been more difficult to quantify, and has presented major problems in standardization. Thus, the strength of the relationship between school achievement and job performance has been largely unverified. Similar data need to be generated between the pre-puberty, adolescent, and on-the-job attitudes toward work. Perhaps these data would show that some stated goals in career education would be beyond the scope of an institution.

---

[4] Detachment is defined as the emotional (as distinct from instrumental) independence from parents.

Gaps to be Covered by Applying Additional Methodologies. Two areas of gaps in research perceived at the two conferences could be filled by applying new methodologies; those which would require cross-sectional data to validate clinical, case, or small (non-representative) sample studies, and those which would require longitudinal data to validate these latter or cross-sectional data already available.

It was argued that Piagetian formal operations have been identified as existing among a wide variety of adolescent individuals and over a range of cultures. However, no data were reported to exist which would allow us to generalize the extent of formal operations among any typical population. For example, it would be valuable to know how many among an average age cohort actually demonstrate use of formal operations and what its distribution might be between and within differing cultures. In addition, it would be valuable to have cross-sectional data to justify statements on the distribution of rebellion or detachment in adolescence.

Increased use of longitudinal studies was called for on multiple occasions during the two conference periods--and for good reason. For example, when interested in whether family interaction patterns differ between early and late maturing adolescents, it was asked how one can control for all of the extraneous environmental influences which would differ between households with a one-shot, cross-sectional approach. Or if one were interested in parental influence on occupational expectations, how much more valuable would an intergenerational study be when one could generalize conclusions beyond a narrowly defined period in the socioeconomic life of the community. On the other hand, longitudinal efforts are only possible after some funding commitment spanning a parallel time period. An intergenerational study (20 or more years) or even an innergenerational study of adolescence (7-10 years) would require special consideration in a government research environment in which contracts and commitments are commonly reviewed on an annual basis.

An Area For New Research. Lastly, there was one broad area where research efforts could conceivably break into new conceptual grounds altogether. This was a call, by Hill and others, to establish a "blue-ribbon national commission" to evaluate the concept of the American junior high school. The junior high school, conceived originally as providing a separate environment so that pre-adolescents could interact without over-competition from more developmentally advanced adolescents, is now entering a period of serious re-thinking. Social scientists have begun to argue that age homogeneity is unnatural and, perhaps socially dysfunctional. Studies on the effects of being in an age-homogeneous environment were called for, using the junior high school as a laboratory. If attitudinal differences with proper controls could be systematically isolated as a result of being in a junior high school, these data, could, in turn, allow us some empirical justification for the generalizations on harmful effects attributed to age segregation in children more generally.[5]

These two meetings symbolized, in microcosm, the exigencies of intercommunication and coordination among professionals interested in adolescent development in general, and work experience activities in particular. Divergencies in focus are natural phenomena in a public sector where groups inevitably differ due not only to their varying experience and training, but to the fact that they have been carefully selected for agencies whose technical languages vary widely. In addition, perceptual schisms are normal between groups of professionals whose purpose is to deal with academic and theoretical questions and those whose purpose is to implement and evaluate melioristic programs.

However, even given these normal structural divergencies, what becomes evident is that these meetings produced more awareness of overlapping concepts than might have been expected. Adolescence is a period of life which spans the concerns of multiple agencies. These two conference meetings successfully provided a unique opportunity where these common concerns could be accurately expressed.

---

[5] This issue will also be dealt with in Chapter II "Commonalities In Calls for Policy on Adolescence 1973/1974."

Section 4: Presentations of Developments in Research on Adolescence--The "Experimenting School"

Perhaps no other institution in society has undergone so close a scrutiny as the school. And there is good reason. Not only do schools account for the largest portion of an adolescent's day time activity, but unlike the family which is segmented into individual units, schools deal with large groups of children. It is not surprising that the school is universally seen as being a fruitful avenue for policy implementation.

The Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adolescence has had a long interest in keeping abreast of the research on schools, school reforms, and schooling alternatives. As a part of that interest, Professors Moshe Smilansky of the Laboratory for the Study of the Disadvantaged at the University of Tel-Aviv, and Donald P. Sanders of the Center for Human Resource Development at Ohio State University, were invited by the Panel to deliver their proposal for "An International Association for the Development of Adolescent Schooling," on September 10th.

Professor Sanders informed the members of the Interagency Panel that an association for adolescent schooling had been formed with branches in six countries. The association's purpose was to link together schools which would report upon their experiments. These schools, according to Sanders, were not experimental schools (those created to test certain hypotheses), but were "experimenting" schools--whose staffs define experiments and test their results for themselves.

According to Sanders and Smilansky, the International Association for Experimenting Schools lay upon a foundation of four propositions. The first asserted that failure from the existing schools could be held responsible for the social problems found among adolescents: "You are all aware of the massive numbers of illiterate young Americans ... and of the existence of high and rising criminality and delinquency." This indicates, Sanders argued that "schools as institutions in their present form are inadequate to the need either of individuals or the needs of society as a whole." This, in turn, explains the emergence of alternative schools which represent efforts to "socially install something to replace this bad thing."

The second proposition for the International Association was that schools have failed as institutions largely because of the impact of modernization, and its concomitant effects upon the family, religion, and work. For example, the essentially rural and nuclear family of the 19th century, where children once derived their sence of identity and self-esteem, has been fragmented in the modern world. Religion also has altered and has become a matter of individual choice; and work in the industrialized world has been segregated from all activity in the home. All of these social processes have led to what Sanders called a "loss of roots."

A third proposition argued that the "aim of policy should be focused upon adolescents." Adolescence is the "critical point in the life segment"; it may be the "optimal time for undertaking the enhancement of adaptive capacity and self-development and coping capacity" and according to Sanders, it must not be forgotten that adolescents are a strategic target group because they will very soon be parents themselves.

A last proposition held that the "experimenting school" represented the best means "to deal with this set of problems." According to Sanders, an "experimenting school" would be one which would: (1) develop coping and self-developmental capacities of its students, teachers, administrators, counselors, and parents; (2) "be responsible for its own ability to operate, ... set goals and establish criteria through which it achieves and doesn't achieve"; (3) provide a sense of efficacy and the ability to control what one does; and (4) have a social climate of responsibility and acceptance of responsibility for oneself and one's friends.

Though he followed Sanders, in general, Smilansky reiterated several of the propositional criteria justifying their concept of the "experimenting school." He wanted to reimpress upon the Adolescence Panel members the rationale for considering the adolescent as a target for prime educational impact. "You can come to the adolescent and tell him he is a man," he said, or "that he is a participant, that he is responsible for his future ... adolescence is the period for early childhood education."

Smilansky offered one additional model as to how the "experimenting school" was to operate. He called it a "chain" of responsibility, with the individual pupil taking responsibility for pursuing his own options, while the "helping school" and the "helping community" surrounding the school provide the necessary environment where the pursuit of those "options" could be explored by an adolescent in an environment of relative security.

"That is the dream," said Sanders as his closing note on the presentation, "People in six countries have expressed a desire to seek and create such schools and to bind together in this association to try to help each other to do so."

The Sanders/Smilansky presentation produced considerable discussion among the Panel members who have had extensive experience with school and educational reform proposals. However, since the propositional justifications for the International Association for Experimenting Schools are germane to a number of other proposals within the section entitled: "Commonalities In Calls for Policy on Adolescence in 1973/1974," the impetus for the ensuing discussion on September 10th can be found in that section.

Section 5: Presentations of Developments in Research on Adolescence--The Boys' Town Centers

In 1972 the board of directors of Boys' Town agreed to set aside approximately $70 million to develop two new centers for research. Approximately $30 million was earmarked for the study of learning and communication disorders and another $40 million for the foundation of three Boys' Town Centers for the Study of Youth Development. Because of the potential impact of these latter on both the Federal and university research communities, the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adolescence decided to invite representatives of the three Boys' Town Centers to present their plans and generally exchange ideas. The three centers were represented by Drs. Ronald Feldman from Omaha, Robert Sears from Stanford, and Sally Ryan from Catholic University in Washington, D. C.

Though the three had been funded so recently that they had not yet even chosen permanent directors--much less formalized their research priorities--there had been a sufficient number of directions established for the Panel members to draw some accurate impressions. Though funded from a central source, the administrative styles of the three centers seem not at all alike. The Stanford Centers, with the exception of its yet-to-be-appointed director, does not have a provision for new faculty. The Catholic University Center has searched for and has already hired new faculty, while the center in Omaha will hire scholars from a wide variety of locales but, unlike either of the other centers, those at the Omaha center will perform no teaching functions whatsoever.

Nor are the three centers required to pursue identical research directions. Each seemed to define its own priorities. Even when studies overlap, identical variables will not be required. However, communication between the three centers seems to be well assured for that has been elevated to a special administrative function of the Omaha branch.

All three representatives expressed pronounced interest in maintaining two characteristics: strong interdisciplinary foci and good, solid theoretical research which, as Sears put it, "is going to be for and helpful to children and to the society of which they are a part." Perhaps to underscore these commonalities, each of the three representatives described the kind of studies--some on-going, some planned--in which they were interested. Ryan mentioned one member of the Catholic University Center who was involved in looking at the social aspects of cognitive development with respect to role participation, communication, and perception among various ages with respect to the morale considerations in peer interaction.

Sears mentioned a specialist at Stanford in the field of juvenile law who was probing the social scientists at the Stanford Boys' Town Center with questions geared to clear applicability for establishing legal precedents. For example, he was asking what do we know about whether a child should or should not be placed in a foster home; or in other words, what are the things which could be "done" to children legally. Other studies at the Stanford Center involved asking what happens to children in "high risk" situations as, for example, in the case of adolescents whose parents are jailed. Some effort has been placed upon the understanding of "shyness" and other inhibitions. Other efforts have been linked to exploring critical techniques of intervention evaluation which would, in relative cost terms, contain the same standards of proof as those which apply to the more pure theoretical disciplines.

Four summary areas for research orientation have been suggested in seminars within the Stanford Boys' Town Center: (1) the general problem of attachment and caretaking; (2) the premature infant; (3) early and middle adolescent adjustment; and (4) research which would benefit the educational situation in both middle class and in ghetto or deprived areas.

Though Feldman, in his presentation, made a number of references to the fact that his center had not, as yet, chosen its director or its exact direction, the explicit organizational pattern at the Omaha Center fully reflected a quality of thoughtful planning. Five divisions are envisioned. The first division would be a Senior Research Division which would bring in eight to ten senior researchers, a similar number of post-doctoral fellows, and two or three visiting scholars annually. This solicited research would be required to be of unique theoretical interest in addition to possessing interventive or applied potential. A second division would have a research utilization and dissemination function for the findings of all the three centers. It would direct its attention not only to scholarly journals but also to para- and non-professional groups who might find the information either of benefit or of interest. A third division would involve training people who are in contact with youths. A fourth, called a Management Information Division, would develop the center's computer capability and any new systems of gathering information on the Boys' Town population. Lastly, a library division would be established which would have the widest possible use of scholars and professionals.

Despite the specificity of organizational structure in Omaha, the portion of Feldman's presentation seemingly most well received by the Panel members were the areas being considered for research directions within the Senior Research Division: the application of the court system to general questions of juvenile justice, the practice of longitudinal research not tied to the "vagaries" of funding; but last, and most interesting to those in his Federal audience, would be an examination of the Federal policies and practices in funding research on youth. Feldman emphasized his vision that the latter would be intimate with the funding idiosyncracies of the Federal government but "relatively independent" from Washington itself.

Dr. Bobbitt, the Assistant Director for the Behavioral Sciences in the Office of Planning and Evaluation, and the Panel representative for the

National Institute for Child and Human Development, perhaps summarized the heightened interests of the Interagency Panel as a whole. He commented on the fact that though financial support was to originate from a single source and though there was an overall demand for research of the highest quality, there seemed to be a lack of the concomitant blend of conformity by enforcement. He pointed out that the directors in Omaha had definite ideas, but there seemed to be an extraordinary amount of room left for independence, originality, and genuine creativity. This had, Bobbitt said, a number of implications for the Federal government. In sum, he said to Feldman and the others that

> ...maybe you've learned some lessons and when you mentioned that you might evaluate Federal functions I hope you will in fact, because what has happened to the Federal government in my opinion is that we have, through no fault of those of us who have been playing the game, lost our flexibility.... Our flexibility to support research is much less than it was 15 years ago because it's become very legalistic with a lot of red tape. I would like to see some basis for arguing for a reversal of this process and I would like to be able to say that there's more 'bang per buck' if you support things in a different pattern... the government is now failing to get this kind of imaginative, creative, product...I'm very excited about the potentiality of this kind of support of the scientific community. It's interesting; it's focused on one segment; it's multi-disciplinary. The certain kinds of applied concerns (which are fine) don't rule out the theoretical contributions either, and I would like to see a sort of comparison with the problems of research support by the Federal government. Now the Federal government can't do the exact same thing, but maybe they might do something that is closer to flexible support than they are doing now.

This theme could hardly help but be echoed among individual discussions following the Boys' Town presentations.

CHAPTER II

COMMONALITIES IN CALLS FOR POLICY ON ADOLESCENCE 1973/1974

Section 1: The Tenor of Past Efforts

Though precedent can be traced far back into the 18th century, it is common to place the 1957 launching of the Soviet satellite Sputnik as a watershed for Federal research interest and support of local and state educational institutions. The fact that the effort came as a result of a perceived crisis is precedent in itself. The belief that Johnny couldn't read, or perhaps more importantly, couldn't understand physics as well as Ivan, eventually helped motivate a myriad of research on curricula, and support for programs as diverse as teacher training and foreign language graduate studies. As a result, millions of youths benefited from new texts and novel learning approaches, while thousands of the brightest young adults used the new benefits from the Federal government to finance their very costly graduate education. Schools and universities across the country eventually profited from the quality of new teachers who may never have been able to afford the training they had received without government support.

When the civil rights movement in the 1960's began to focus attention first on blacks in the South, later on urban ghettos, and lastly on all minorities and less privileged children regardless of residence, similar Federal catch-up research and program efforts were instituted. Besides the focus upon school achievement however, there were parallel efforts concentrated upon nutrition, employment, housing, voting and other equality of opportunity rights. As part of the realization that the average minority child was well below national norms on a number of standardized performance indices held to be necessary for advancement in an industrial society (verbal ability, reading level, non-verbal intellectual tasks, math, science, etc.) efforts to equalize opportunity naturally gravitated to the earliest of possible points for intervention--the preschool years. The operating principle which lay under most of these efforts was to encourage those cognitive and social experiences in which poverty and minority children have been deemed lacking. Implanting these experiences, which were hypothesized as being relevant to standardized performance evaluations, was hoped to aid children initially to do better in primary school, secondly, to continue attendance in high school, thirdly, to be and to feel more capable of attending college, and lastly, as a result, be more successful in attaining positions of responsibility and affluence in the occupational structure. Parallel opportunity programs such as Upward Bound, Talent Search, Special Services, and Equal Opportunity Grants, were designed to encourage fully proportional participation in post-secondary institutions.[1] In the largest sense, these opportunity programs were efforts to encourage whatever skills were used as criteria for eventual upward occupational mobility and the consequent relief of financial and social poverty whose effects had begun the cycle in the first place.

Many are now at least familiar with the general empirical results of the early intervention effort. Preschool programs providing experiences which were hoped to affect performance on standardized tests failed to accomplish their expectations. Though many scores of preschool children were raised from the norm of their targeted group, fewer reached the norm for the referent group. In addition, those preschool children whose scores did show gains, often fell back to the targeted group norms after the early intervention children had spent several years in primary schools integrated with children without similar advantages.

It is unfortunate for these programs that performance results were often interpreted as the sole criteria of program failure or success Project administrators who were the most disappointed may have taken insufficient cognizance of two facts: (1) that our understanding of the characteristics which might affect performance scores especially on intellectual aptitude tasks is by and large correlational in nature, and (2) any effort to cause higher scores is highly experimental. Programs were sometimes judged as failures not because they failed but because the expectations for their success were unrealistic.[2] Nevertheless, partly as a result of the controversy initiated by the early intervention results,[3] attention in the latter part of the decade gravitated to two other questions: a possibility that the standardized performance criteria used for successful achievement is "biased" against the poor or against minority children or both;[4] and the consequent suggestion that the equality of opportunity should be effected, not by the equalizing performance on selection criteria, but by equalizing institutional participation irrespective of the previous selection criteria.

---

[1] A basic assumption of all the opportunity programs seems to have been that the goal for success would be to equalize the proportion of the target group reaching the standard for the referent group--taken as either a white or a socioeconomic norm. For example, an equal educational opportunity program might be judged successful if the proportion of Native Americans from a given area attending college would equal the proportion of Anglos attending college from the same area. The over or under representation, in more formal terms, is called a "selectivity ratio." In a case where Native Americans from a given area are attending college in proportion equal to that of the referent group, they would have a selectivity ratio of exactly 1.0.

Both of these questions involve complex academic and political arguments which are, as yet, unresolved. Both will prove to draw attention in the future because both have unprecedented constitutional implications. However, it would be a mistake to judge Federal efforts to improve the opportunities for poverty and minority children as "failures" because of these unresolved issues. The recent decades have witnessed considerable economic and social change which has had pronounced effects upon blacks and other minorities. Recent statistics from the Office of Management and Budget, for example, show that between 1966 and the present, minorities have had higher proportions of their preschool children enrolled than have whites,[5] and this seems to have been the tendency right across virtually all socioeconomic categories. Besides the fact that the proportion of minorities attending undergraduate institutions increased from approximately 4% to approximately 18% between 1940 and 1972, the effect of social change during the 1960's might be illustrated by the fact that this minority proportion increased by several percentage points between 1968 and 1972 at a time when the proportion of white males attending undergraduate institutions fell by about 5 percentage points. In addition, the proportion of new professional and technical minorities in the labor force between 1950 and 1970 increased on a par with that of whites, while the minority increase in craftsmen and foremen far outstripped the proportional increment among whites (United States Department of Commerce, 1973, p. 79, 87, 121).

---

[2] In passing, it should be noted that, judged upon other criteria, these programs may have been very successful indeed. By any standard, they injected valuable educational experiences into the lives of children who never would have had the experience otherwise; they involved parents and local minority teachers in interpersonal efforts with their own children; and they provided bright and pleasant places for children to be. It could be argued that these, in themselves, are legitimate goals. The question of whether or not children with these special preschool experiences stay in school longer has never been fully pursued.

[3] Perhaps the most noteworthy in this regard is Arthur Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement," Harvard Educational Review 1969, 39, pp. 1-123.

[4] One of the better summaries of this argument is one of the earliest. Allison Davis, Social Class Influences on Learning (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948).

This is not to say that the life situation of minorities in the United States is yet on a parallel to that of the majority. On the contrary, even though many of the social gaps between the races have been substantially lessened,[6] by 1971, minorities still could be expected to die 6.7 years earlier, have 13.4% more of their infants die per 1,000, and in 17% of their cases, be found in substandard housing units (United States Department of Commerce, 1973, p. 27, 32, 192, 196). Nevertheless, the programs to benefit minorities have been admirable responses to real needs and their efforts have substantially improved the lives of millions of children.

There has, however, been an additional evolution of Federal research and program development in response to the public awakening in the later 1960's to the very serious problems of drug-abuse and "run-away" behavior among adolescents. The spread of hallucinogenic drugs such as marijuana, L.S.D.

---

[5] The year 1971, however, was an exception as the percentage of minority preschool children enrolled in school dipped by approximately 1.5% below that of whites.

[6] Between 1940 and 1971 the minority-white "gap" in life expectancy narrowed by 60%, the gap in infant mortality by 44%, in the percentage of households in crowded conditions by 58%. Between 1950 and 1971 the gap in the percentage of each race living in substandard housing units lessened by 41%. (United States Department of Commerce, Social Indicators-1973. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973, p. 27, 32, 192, 196.)

and mescaline was at first of no less concern than was the spread of heroin. Case history reports of teenagers who had "dropped out," run away, or just become lost were increasingly common and came to be addressed by a number of Federal agencies. But the difference in these responses lay in what has now become an obvious fact--that these Federal efforts had to include non-minority, non-poverty, and non-inner city populations. As a result, it was not uncommon for research and ameliorative programs to have direct contact with children coming from homes which have not been categorized as "deficient" or "underprivileged" under any of the commonly utilized social indicators.

Figures on the actual prevalence of drug abuse are not easily obtained,[7] and it will be necessary for a number of Federal agencies to view the abuse of drugs by adolescents as one of the nation's most tenacious problem areas. However, there seems to be a qualitative shift at present which may, along with programs targeted for the less privileged, be an indication of a representative trend in the approach to adolescence problems in general. The shift in emphasis stems from several rather sophisticated distinctions which have evolved into a humane approach resulting from over a decade of experience with adolescent drug abuse. Not only is it increasingly common to point out distinctions between "soft" and "hard" drugs, but also between drug "experimentation" and drug "abuse." Nor is it common to restrict definitions of drugs to those items which are presently illegal. The fact that commonly found and legally sold items such as alcohol or drugstore purchased pills such as Valium are increasingly listed alongside items such as marijuana adds a multitude of adults from privileged socioeconomic categories to those who might be catalogued as "drug abusers." This approach cannot help but effect a decrease in any social dissonance between adolescents and adults.

There are additional changes perceptible in the approach to drug abuse which also may be indicative of a more generalized change in the perception of adolescence. A 1973 publication of the National Institute of Mental Health reminds its readers that "the majority of youngsters navigate adolescence without succumbing to drugs," and that "no adult, and especially not a teacher, should identify hair length or outlandish dress with drug use" (Macleod, 1973, p. 70). Furthermore, adolescents who really do abuse drugs (cases for example in which adolescents find themselves habitual users, where they have lost a sense of any reality) are now more likely to be taken as individuals for whom the overuse of drugs is part of a generalized malaise associated with serious emotional difficulties.

---

[7] Actual incidence, supported by rigorous empirical justification, as opposed to surmised incidence, supported by the popular press, is one of the most crucial needs for planning adolescent research and development. Two of the more noteworthy efforts in the former category are: (1) "A nationwide Drug Abuse Survey," being led by Dr. Ira Cisin at the Social Research Group, George Washington University, and (2) "A Study to Determine the Feasibility of Estimating the Incidence of Running Away," funded by ASPE within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on a contractual basis with the Behavioral Research and Evaluation Corporation, 1975.

These are important shifts. The use of drugs among adolescents has been so universalized a difficulty beyond geographic, socioeconomic or racial categories that the approach to drugs may have paved the way to a broader perspective on adolescence in general and may have influenced the more recent tenors in 1973/1974.

Section 2: The Tenor of Recent Suggestions for Policy on Adolescence

It is not irrelevant to note that in 1972, when the President's Office of Science and Technology wanted to document the most recent and incisive thinking on adolescence, it invited nine of the nation's best scholars to form a Panel on Youth and asked James S. Coleman to serve as its chairman. Two of Coleman's earlier efforts served indirectly as focal assumptions: The Adolescent Society (1961) and the Equality of Educational Opportunity report (1966) referred to hereafter as the EEOR. The former served to augment arguments as to whether or not there exists an independent adolescent culture, and if so, whether this "culture" is anti-adult or neutral and isolated from adult culture.[8]

---

[8] With empirical justification for each side, the argument is as yet unresolved. However, the fact that Coleman agreed to formally introduce the argument of his principal challengers indicates that even he is open to the possibility that youth "culture" may, in point of fact, be largely an extension of the surrounding adult context. See the introduction to: Denice B. Kandel and Gerald S. Lesser, Youth In Two Worlds (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Incorporated, 1972). The relevance to the present argument is simply (continued)

The latter work served in providing the crucial background assumptions about how adolescents perform in schools. For example, in accounting for the variance in performance either on an academic task or on an intellectual aptitudinal measure, given the 1966 findings of the EEOR, one would not expect the schools' facilities, books, equipment, laboratories, teaching personnel, or administrative staff to make the greatest difference one way or another. The report of the Panel on Youth and other recent calls for policy have had as their background, the EEOR finding that if one were to know the personal characteristics of the pupils themselves, such as their socioeconomic status, race, or some measure of how they felt about themselves, one might expect to account for more variance on performance tasks than with all physical facility factors combined. More specifically, the two measures of a child's feelings about himself in the EEOR survey, a measure of efficacy and a parallel measure of self-concept, yielded higher effects on test performance than any other single factor. "Of all the variables measured in the survey," the EEOR stated,

> including all measures of family background and all school variables, these attitudes showed the strongest relation to achievement at all three grade levels. The zero-order correlations of these attitudes with achievement were higher than those of any other variable...taken alone these attitude variables account for more of the variation in achievement than any other set of variables (all family background variables taken together or all school variables taken together). When added to any other set of variables, they increase the accounted for variation more than any other set of variables. (Coleman et al., 1966, p. 319)

The findings of the EEOR were relevant to the more recent suggestions for policy on adolescence for one fundamental reason. It was the EEOR which began to break the log-jammed assumptions that incrementing new

---

this: if youth "culture" contains intimate idiosyncracies of the surrounding adult culture, this implies that youth, for all of the previous emphasis on its independence of life style, may be closer to how we, as adults, feel than originally theorized. For example, it is argued that youth living in modern suburban environments experience a sense of isolation because of high rates of family turnover, a lack of communal interaction opportunities, etc. With the exception of the tendency for adults to generally have more use of a car, is the fact that suburban adults often feel similarly isolated and lonely so separate an issue from that of those who are younger?

physical facilities and equipment could significantly affect the average cognitive performances of large numbers of children. The report documented this central phenomenon: if one is interested in affecting the performances of children, one should pay more attention to who as opposed to what is found in the school.

The supreme importance of a child's personal characteristics, and particularly his personal attitudes, may be the theoretical link to the more recent approaches to adolescence. The purview of these approaches seems to encompass a perspective which transcends the factors of material or even ethnic privileges. By choosing to focus upon the non-material, they choose to look at the broadest aspects of the industrial-cultural environment of youth, that is, how youth feel about themselves, and why. It is fair to say that the most significant extension from the EEOR is the present systematic pursuance for answers to this latter question of why.

The Panel on Youth addresses itself to the same issues in the raising of our adolescents which have been addressed by the White House Conference on Youth (1971), the National Commission to Reform Secondary Education (1973), the National Institute of Mental Health (Macleod, 1973), and the National Commission on Resources for Youth Incorporated (McClousky and Kleinbard, 1974).

In short, there are three issues: (1) Youth in our industrial society tend to be segregated (a) from adults and (b) within limited age groups. (2) The pattern of enforced formal schooling and later "encouraged" (read expected) formal schooling up to and into the period of adulthood is believed to limit sufficient individual divergence in training or experience roles. The position of student, especially in large groups, is essentially passive and it is argued that other roles are essential to a normal transition to adulthood. Furthermore, in response to overexposure to a passive role, it is argued that even for "normal" youth it is common to develop feelings of purposelessness, hostility, and inadequacy. As a prolonged occupation without variety, "studenthood" does not allow youths to "feed" that part of themselves which would like to feel productive and appreciated in the wider community. (3) Laws originally conceived at a time when youth needed protection from the wider society may now have served beyond their utility and may, in fact, act as serious constraints upon both the consumption and production activities of young people.

Though the members of the Panel on Youth[9] did not address newly defined questions, their approach signaled some rather significant deviations from the past. More importantly, the Panel on Youth's approach is often shared by other commissions recommending government policy and may eventually prove to be as much a watershed on the approach to adolescence as the EEOR was to that of performance in school. For example, without ignoring the serious problems yet to be solved among urban ghetto youth or among those adolescents who have fallen into the habits of delinquency or of drug abuse, it is emphasized that we, as a society, must also address ourselves to the problems of youth who are neither materially deficient or deviant, and who are "normal" within the general cultural context. These recent approaches all express the belief that our normal youth are seriously lacking, not in things, but in feelings and experiences. The central question raised is basically normative in its intent, and anthropological in its content; it asks: How should we raise our youth in our industrial culture?

A second deviation from the past seems to be a sense of realism and unsentimentality attached to historical cultural norms. Since Paul Goodman's Growing Up Absurd was published in 1960, it has been common to trace the long series of changes which first narrowed down a household to a nuclear existence, then sent mothers into the labor force, and lastly, with increasing divorce, further limited a child's opportunity for parenting; however, there now seems less of an idealistic inclination to return to what was. There is not a great deal of nostalgia nor belief that communal, return-to-the-land alternative life styles hold in any way a viable alternative. For example, the

---

[9] The following were members: John M. Mays, now a Science Advisor with the National Institute of Education, Zahava Blum Doering (Research Staff), now a consultant to the Rand Corporation, Norman B. Ryder of the Office of Population Research at Princeton University, Joseph F. Kett, Department of History, University of Virginia, Zvi Griliches, Department of Economics, Harvard University, Dorothy H. Eichorn, Child Study Center, University of California at Berkeley, John B. Davis, Superintendent of Schools in Minneapolis, Minnesota, Burton R. Clark, Department of Sociology, Yale University, Robert H. Bremner, Department of History, Ohio State University, and James S. Coleman (Chairman), Department of Sociology, University of Chicago.

Panel on Youth mentioned that though 19th century households provided a variety of people from whom a child could draw support and to which he could identify himself, the status of the household tended to define an individual's opportunity throughout his lifetime. Thus, the "traditional" household could have been very inhibiting. As Coleman says in an article describing the Panel's report,

> As a result of many changes, of which the movement of mothers out of the home is only the latest, the average home in America will never be what it was, and it will never regain the range of functions in socializing its children that it once had. The end result may be better children or worse children, but the home, household, and family will play a decreasing role in the world of the child. (Coleman, 1974, p. 3)

The point is well taken. Our society is industrial and largely peri-urban. It will never again be rural. Nor will our families ever again be extended. The question posed now is how can we provide the best experiences for developing strong, self-confident and relatively happy individuals from the context of our given life-style realities.

The third deviation from previous efforts is more subtle. Throughout the decade of the 1960's, plans to equalize opportunity or diminish drug abuse often had specific rate-of-monetary-return assumptions built into their justifications. The more recent approaches, which attack problems such as loneliness, isolation, social responsibility, age segregation and feelings of inefficacy, do not. There are no claims that higher earnings or lower crime rates should be compared to program costs so as to justify implementation. It is not denied that attitudinal changes should occur, and in fact, it is argued that they in themselves are sufficient returns.[10] Nor are costs disregarded on specific suggestions, like the suggestion, for example, that smaller schools whose non-academic functions are dispersed throughout the local community would not be any more expensive to construct than the grandiose multi-purpose educational plants presently considered the norm. But the overall tendency does not emphasize measurable increments or savings of any kind. These recent approaches to adolescence ask a simple question concerning how we are to raise our youths. They answer it by responding to various changes we might consider in the legal system, in the school system and in the market place. Though they emphasize areas for pilot research programs, they generally tie their legitimacy not to how much it will save, but to the logic of what is right to do. This may, but it may not,have an empirical monetary justification.[11]

---

[10] The Panel on Youth does advocate close measurements of attitudinal objectives, but they admit that these non-cognitive scales are not as highly developed as those in the cognitive realm. For some objectives, such as that of youths taking responsibility for others, the Panel on Youth settles for simply "time spent in the activity" as a sufficient criterion of success. There is a loud and clear call for the development of more sophisticated non-cognitive evaluation measurements, not to justify the implementation of innovations but more to avoid reverting to the old standby measures of cognitive skills "since standardized measures do exist there." (Panel on Youth, 1973, p. 151)

The fourth but perhaps most significant departure from other approaches involves the manner in which the role of the school is portrayed in suggestions for reform. Since the first efforts by Frederick the Great in the 18th century to solve a national problem by harnessing up the public schools, it has become common to assume that the school is an effective institution for this purpose. The assumption was well articulated in the 19th century by Thomas Mann, who believed that the American public school could not only solve the societal dilemma of poverty by making newly literate youth occupationally functional, but in addition could eliminate crime by helping to instill the proper moral development. As a result, there evolved a divergence between those educational curricula which were designed to help ameliorate a particular societal problem and those whose rationale was to educate for an academic purpose--with attendant social status overtones for children within one or the other of the orientations.[12]

---

[11] This approach is strengthened by the fact that previous rate of return studies have tended to oversimplify their measurements in four ways: (1) they have often ignored indirect returns; (2) they have insufficiently allowed for a situation of non-pure competition where the return in some way has been artifically skewed (the returns to attending one trade high school in Chicago are suprisingly high because the unions control selection into the school, and all graduates find union jobs); (3) they have often not incorporated systematic developments over time, i.e., they have suffered the normal deficiencies of cross-sectional data, and (4) they have never been able to sufficiently control for the intervening effects of native ability, motivation, family status, or luck.

Since the days of John Dewey, adding one more function, one more task, or one more expectation to the school has become almost de rigueur for any attempt to improve the lives of young people. As a result, the surrounding professional population of physical education instructors, football coaches, career counselors, shop teachers, driver's education instructors, psychologists, nurses, home economics instructors, dance, music and painting instructors has burgeoned to the point where a typical school has become a factory. This has occurred not so much because students are scheduled, but because with all of these expectations for the school located in only one place, the definition of what constitutes a normal school has insured a quantity of scale which in turn necessitates a factory-like impersonality.

The report of the Panel on Youth diverges from this whole tradition and in so doing, places itself in rather small company. Although the National Commission for Reform of Secondary Education (1973) made recommendations that youths be given options to leave school before age 16, and others have recommended that youths spend part of their school year in non-student roles (White House Conference on Youth, 1971, p. 197) or even that they work for the whole junior-high-school age period (Leet, 1974), the Panel on Youth suggests that some of the functions which now act as part of the school should be diverted to other smaller and more specialized institutions. Among proposals for reform, this may be truely unique.[13] In short, the Panel on Youth argued that:

> the benefits of incorporating non-cognitive activities into schools are far fewer than those from organizing them outside schools. The principal benefit of the former path appears to be organizational "neatness" and insurance that all youth will be "covered" by such

---

[12] This trend is not confined to either the United States or Western Europe. See Stephen P. Heyneman, The Conflict Over What Is To Be Learned In School: A History of Curriculum Politics in Africa, (Syracuse: Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs Monograph, 1971).

[13] One could, perhaps, argue that the Ivan Illich "deschooling" argument is similar. However, besides being politically motivated, his argument assumes that schools give over-attention to academic tasks; the Panel on Youth argument does not imply that. See Ivan Illich, De-Schooling Society (New York: Harper and Row, 1971).

> activity. But the costs are the distortion of such activity to fit the organizational characteristics of a school, a distortion that strikes at the very heart of the activity.... If a larger social setting--the community or the city--were seen as the environment, or a set of environments, for the growth of a young person, then the school...would delegate a portion of its present custody to other institutions. Time in school could be cut by reducing school functions to the more strictly academic ones. But school personnel would then also plan to be the main agents of the young, acting in their interests in employing other institutions of the community. The school would purchase a set of services for youth, making it an important potential source of social change. (Panel on Youth, 1973, p. 143 and 156)

What this would imply is that students should not be denied the non-academic experiences which are necessary to development, but that the school, as is presently structured, should return to that which it does best and most efficiently--the very necessary pursuit of things academic; but preferably for shorter periods of time and in much smaller buildings.[14]

These four tendencies will likely be common features of research and development programs involving adolescents. The Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adolescence will serve to monitor these new approaches, centralize the programmatic and research findings on the specific suggestions of the Panel on Youth and other commissions, and report these findings between Federal agencies, to the Congress, and to the various professionals who all have an interest in the same central question: How should we raise our youths in an industrial society? The following chapter presents a more detailed descriptive breakdown of the research which the Federal government is funding on adolescence during the current fiscal year.

---

[14] Professor Donald Holsinger of the University of Chicago has raised several substantive criticisms concerning this point. First he has asked about the logistical exigencies. Second, he has reminded the chairman of the Panel on Youth of the empirical justifications for placing more, not less, emphasis upon the role of the school in terms of both attitudinal out-put and monetary (or occupational) productivity. See Donald B. Holsinger, "AERA Discussion Notes" of the Socialization, Schooling, and Society Symposium, Annual Meetings of the AERA, Chicago, March, 1974.

CHAPTER III

PATTERNS OF FEDERAL RESEARCH ON ADOLESCENTS IN FY '74

Section 1: Methodological Concerns

The data are derived from nineteen separate branches of the Federal government whose titles appear below in Figure 2.

Figure 2

Agencies From Which The Data Are Derived

Department of Health, Education and Welfare:
- (1) Office of Youth Development (OYD)
- (2) National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD)
- (3) National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH)
- (4) National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA)
- (5) National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA)
- (6) National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke (NINDS)
- (7) Bureau of Community Health Services (BCHS)
- (8) Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS)
- (9) National Institute of Education (NIE)
- (10) Office of Child Development (OCD)
- Office of Education:
    - (11) Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation (OPBE)
    - (12) Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (BOAE)
    - (13) Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH)
    - (14) Office of Indian Education (OIE)
    - (15) Right-To-Read Program
    - (16) Bureau of School Systems (BSS)

(17) Department of Agriculture (USDA)
(18) Department of Labor (DOL)
(19) ACTION

The intensity of interest in the adolescence age range varies between agencies. For example, the Departments of Labor and Agriculture by legislative mandate focus upon problems which primarily concern adults; the Office of Education, on the other hand, may be thought of as primarily concerned with problems involving nonadults. Thus, the purpose of the two Interagency Panels has not been to garner a representation of all the activities of these Federal agencies but instead, to collect a total summary of that portion of their research programs which in some way directly involves children in the age range of adolescence or early childhood. However, the specific definitions of these age ranges do differ slightly. NIMH, NIDA, and NIAAA define adolescents as children between the ages of 12 and 25. NICHD defines the same group as those between the ages of 9 and 21; OYD and OCD define their "youth" as those falling between ages 10 and 17. And whereas OE, NIE and ACTION include those within the undergraduate college ages, other agencies, such as SRS, NINDS, BCHS, and USDA refer to the age range simply as "adolescents," "youth" or "young people" without additional specification. Nevertheless, these alternative definitions should be attributed not to a lack of interagency coordination in this area, but to very different agency mandates.

The objective of the two Interagency Panels has been to collect information on all Federal research, development, demonstration and evaluation projects (R, D, D, & E) which include or directly effect nonadults. These exclude Federal programs whose purposes focus only upon the supply of services. In order to be included within the purview of the two Interagency Panels, a project proposal has to have contained one of these components. Though carefully done, the decision to include or exclude projects as research and development primarily affecting nonadults, was not easily made. Teacher training projects not having a sample of children in the evaluation design were omitted. The same was true of integration or vocational support projects. Therefore, with these exclusions, the sum of these projects can be taken as representing only those activities which can be identified as R, D, D, & E on children or adolescents.

Since each individual agency naturally has an independent system of file maintenance, access to the proposals has had to be achieved in a nonuniform fashion. Four general patterns have emerged which deserve a brief note.

Most often the agency gave the coders from the Social Research Group a listing of titles and code numbers or agency projects which involved children or young adults. The coders then utilized the list to reference the location of the actual proposals. This held true for example in NIMH, NICHD and NIE. A second pattern was for the coders to be given all the age relevant project abstracts from which they would note those which had been terminated and then, as in the former pattern, reference the full project proposal from the agency code number. This, for example, occurred within OCD. A third pattern was for the coder to be given a list of all the agency's projects from which the coder himself would identify those which would apply to children. For example, this was the case within OE/Office of Environmental Education (within BSS) and in NINDS. Lastly, a pattern evolved where coders went directly through all the agency's files of the full project proposals, picking out only those which applied to children or adolescents. This became the process in OE/BEH, OE/Right-To-Read, and BCHS.

Slight differences also occurred in the precise sources from which the information was derived. The goal had been for the trained coders to see each of the individual project proposals. This could not be achieved in USDA where its 62 project proposals remained at the regional centers throughout the country. Proposals could not be obtained for the intramural projects of NIMH (21), NINDS (3), and NICHD (19) whose funding was administered without a proposal format. Nor could complete proposals be obtained for the approximately 20 training center projects of SRS or in 10 cases within NIMH and 15 at NIE where proposals were checked out within the organization and could not be located at the time of the coding visit. Information in these special cases was obtained in two ways: first by looking at the proposal abstracts, and second, in the case of SRS and the intramural studies, by coding from the agency's most recent annual report. But out of the total 3,116 projects which involved children and adolescents, in 95.2% of the cases, the information was garnered by looking directly at the full project proposal itself.

Yet though there are still several Federal agencies funding research and development projects on nonadults which were not included within the FY '74 data base,[1] these 19 agencies and branches which were included represent the full range of Federal research activity on children. The fact is, that with the few exceptions noted above, this file is an attempt to establish a full description of every Federally funded project proposal for the most recent fiscal year: that of FY '74.

---

[1] Among the studies not included would be those funded through the Law Enforcement Assistance Agency within the Department of Justice, the Department of Defense, and the National Science Foundation.

Section 2: Patterns Of Total Federal Research Activity On Children And Adolescents In FY '74

In FY '74 the United States Federal government allocated $303,275,051 for funding 3,116 independent research and development projects in hopes of understanding and improving the lives of children or adolescents.[2] The Office of Education (OE), sponsoring 1,251 projects, was the single most active agency in both numbers of projects (40.2%) and in amount of funding (56.6%). This is illustrated by Table 1. The National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH--18.7%), and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD--11.3%)also funded a relatively larger number of projects. In looking at the percentage of total funding, however, a separate pattern becomes evident. The second most active agency, NIE (16.3%), was not followed as closely either by NIMH (8.3%) or by NICHD (8.3%). Yet, in terms of both funding and numbers of projects, the activity was widely spread. The National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA) funded 79 separate projects involving $6.9 million; the National Institute of Neurological Disease and Stroke (NINDS), 87 projects worth $8 million; the Bureau of Community Health Services (BCHS), 65 projects and $4 million; the Social and Rehabilitation Service (SRS), 69 projects and $1.8 million; the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), 62 projects and $.5 million; and the Department of Labor (DOL), 33 projects and $1.3 million.

In Table 2, the total Federal activity is divided by funding categories and methodological techniques. By far the most commonly found orientation was for a grant to be made for applied purposes. Grants accounted for 85.3% of the Federal projects and 77.1% of the Federal funds, while applied research accounted for 62.2% of the projects and 75.3% of the funds. Nevertheless, despite the fact that any government in a democracy would be subject to constant public pressure for immediate applicable research goals,

---

[2] Because of the absence of several agencies from the data base, these figures may be somewhat lower than a final total.

Table 1

Total Federal Research Activity Involving Children Or Adolescents In FY '74 By Agency

Agency	# of Fed. Projects (%)		Amount of Fed. Funds (%)	
DHEW				
OYD	16	(.5)	$ 906,645	(.3)
NICHD	353	(11.3)	25,035,026	(8.3)
NIMH	582	(18.7)	24,138,800	(8.3)
NIDA	79	(2.5)	6,919,404	(2.3)
NIAAA	14	(.5)	510,902	(.2)
NINDS	87	(2.8)	8,028,740	(2.7)
BCHS	65	(2.1)	3,989,219	(1.3)
SRS	69	(2.2)	1,827,628	(.6)
NIE	400	(12.8)	49,331,066	(16.3)
OCD	100	(3.2)	9,885,666	(3.3)
Office of Education:				
OPBE	27	(.9)	5,156,758	(1.7)
BOAE	159	(5.1)	14,255,606	(4.7)
BEH	315	(10.1)	36,018,250	(11.9)
OIE	134	(4.3)	12,703,977	(4.2)
Right-To-Read	148	(4.8)	9,555,231	(3.1)
BSS	468	(15.0)	83,711,948	(27.6)
OE Total	1,251	(40.2)	171,578,594	(56.6)
USDA	62	(2.0)	544,396	(.2)
DOL	33	(1.1)	1,337,730	(.5)
ACTION	5	(.2)	8,294,698	(2.7)
TOTAL	3,116	(100)	$303,275,051	(100)

Table 2

Total Federal Research Activity Involving Children Or Adolescents In FY '74 By Project Characteristics

	N = 3,116 % of Federal Projects	$ = 303.3 million % of Federal Funds
FUNDING CATEGORY[a]		
Contract	13.4	22.8
Grant	85.3	77.1
Intramural	1.2	.1
TYPE OF R, D & E[a]		
Basic Research	25.6	12.9
Applied Research	62.2	75.3
Evaluation	5.1	4.2
Research on Planning	1.7	.9
Research Support Activities	5.4	6.6
METHODOLOGIES[b]		
Clinical	7.3	6.4
Case Study	4.7	3.1
Survey Techniques	11.1	8.8
Observational Techniques	14.6	11.5
Interview Techniques	12.7	10.8
Use of Questionnaires	14.7	12.9

[a] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research, development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[b] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

Table 3

Total Federal Research Activity Involving Children Or Adolescents In FY '74 By Primary Project Focus

Primary Focus[a]	N = 3,116 % of Federal Projects	$ = 303.3 Million % of Federal Funds
Development	28.4	16.3
Physical Development	11.7	8.4
Cognitive Development	9.0	3.6
Socioemotional Development	6.7	2.3
Family	3.5	1.6
Neighborhood	.4	.3
Social Change	1.4	1.0
Health/Welfare Services	10.3	7.1
Educational Institutions	52.3	71.5
Preschool	4.9	4.4
Primary School	14.0	24.3
Secondary School	6.8	4.8
Post-Secondary School	2.9	4.1
Vocational/Technical Schools	3.5	4.9
Law Enforcement	1.1	1.0
The Research Process	2.0	1.2

[a] All major categories mutually exclusive, and all subcategories within a major category are also mutually exclusive.

the fact that Federal agencies still managed the foresight to invest $38.8 million (12.9%) in very necessary basic research deserves special note.[3] It appears that, among methodologies, questionnaires and observational techniques (14.7% and 14.6%) and interview and survey approaches (12.7% and 11.1%) seem to have clustered together as those most frequently applied.

In Table 3, Federal emphasis is displayed according to the project's primary purpose.[4] Two patterns emerge. First, very considerable emphasis has been placed upon the developmental processes: physical, cognitive, and socioemotional. These accounted for 28.4% and 16.3% of the Federal projects and funds, respectively. Second, however, is the dominant role which educational institutions played in Federal research and development activity affecting nonadults. Alone, research and development on schools assumed 52.3% of all Federal projects and fully 71.5% of all Federal funds. These projects ran the full range, from efforts to improve teaching techniques to curriculum, audio-visual aids, administration or alternatives to traditional educational institutions. Because of the dominance of these institutions, it might be valuable to focus briefly upon the patterns of distribution within research on education. These are displayed in Tables 4 and 5.

As Table 4 illustrates, NIE accounted for 17.1% of the Federal projects on educational institutions and 21.3% of the allocated funds. Other sizeable contributions were made by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (17.5% and 15.1%), and the Bureau of School systems (28.3% and 37.8), both within the Office of Education. But in addition, there was notable interest expressed by the Department of Labor, the Office of Child Development and the National Institute of Mental Health. Though the size of NIE activity was larger than many other agencies, most research and development activity on educational institutions was administered through the Office of Education. That agency accounted for 73.8% of the Federal projects and 71.8% of the Federal funds devoted to education research and development.

---

[3] For purposes of this study, basic research has been defined as that effort which is directed primarily toward an increase in knowledge.

[4] Each project has been placed into one of the eight purposes (or eight subpurposes) which are displayed in Table 3. No project was permitted to be labelled as focusing upon more than one category.

Table 4

Federal Research And Development Activity On Educational Institutions Of Children And Adolescents In FY '74

Agency	N = 1,634 % of N	$ = 216.1 Million % of $
DHEW		
OYD	.4	.1
NICHD	.2	.1
NIMH	3.3	1.2
NIDA	.5	.4
NIAAA	.2	.0
NINDS	--	--
BCHS	.2	.1
SRS	.6	.03
NIE	17.1	21.3
OCD	1.5	1.2
Office of Education:		
OPBE	1.5	2.3
BOAE	9.6	6.5
BEH	17.5	15.1
OIE	7.8	5.7
Right-To-Read	9.1	4.4
BSS	28.3	37.8
OE Total	73.8	71.8
USDA	.6	.0
DOL	1.5	.5
ACTION	.1	3.1

Table 5

Federal Research And Development On Educational Institutions Of Children And Adolescents In FY '74 By Type of Activity

	Ed. Evaluation Research		Ed. Basic Research		Ed. Pilot Studies		Ed. Demonstration Projects	
	% of #	% of $	% of #	% of $	% of #	% of $	% of #	% of $
DHEW								
OYD	-	-	-	-	.3	-	.4	.1
NICHD	-	-	-	-	3.9	1.2	-	-
NIMH	6.4	2.2	3.0	3.3	7.7	1.7	1.2	.5
NIDA	3.2	4.0	1.5	-	-	-	-	-
NIAAA	-	-	-	-	.6	-	-	-
NINDS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BCHS	-	-	-	-	.6	-	-	-
SRS	2.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NIE	37.2	28.5	73.1	70.6	19.2	22.4	1.9	11.2
OCD	4.3	.07	4.5	13.2	3.9	1.0	.9	.6
Office of Education	35.2	62.8	15.0	11.8	57.7	68.2	95.2	87.4
OPBE	20.2	48.5	3.0	-	-	-	-	-
BOAE	6.4	4.7	-	-	19.2	5.8	6.3	3.0
BEH	4.3	2.8	12.0	11.8	19.2	6.3	17.7	15.0
OIE	1.1	2.4	-	-	3.9	7.1	13.3	8.9
Right-To-Read	-	-	-	-	-	-	19.0	5.4
BSS	3.2	4.4	-	-	15.4	49.0	38.9	55.1
USDA	3.2	.2	1.5	-	-	-	-	-
DOL	8.5	2.4	1.5	1.5	7.7	5.4	.3	.1
ACTION	-	-	-	-	.3	.1	.1	-
TOTAL AMOUNTS	N = 94	$ = 9.7 Million	N = 67	$ = 1.6 Million	N = 26	$ = 4.2 Million	N = 774	$=109.2 Million

However, if these educational research and development activities are carefully broken down into areas of purpose, as they are in Table 5, several distinct patterns seem to emerge. First, in the field of "Basic" educational research, defined as research directed primarily toward the increase of knowledge, NIE played its most visible role by sponsoring 73.1% of the Federal projects and 70.6% of the Federal funds. Secondly, in the areas of "Pilot Studies" and especially "Educational Demonstration" projects, NIE assumed a relatively moderate role by sponsoring only 22.4% and 11.2% of the funds, and 19.2% and 1.9% of the projects in those areas, respectively. In addition, it is important to point out the fact that significant and helpful work was being supported by the Department of Labor and the National Institute of Mental Health in research involving both pilot studies and evaluations, the Office of Child Development in the area of basic research, and the National Institute of Drug Abuse in the area of evaluation research. In sum, NIE appears to have played the most significant role in one specific area of educational research: that of basic research. But the myriad efforts on educational research and development is much wider than one area, and a multitude of institutions are presently involved in a serious way.

Section 3: Patterns Of Federal Research Activity On Adolescent Target Groups In FY '74

Of the total 3,116 Federal projects in FY '74, 1,964 (63%) in some way involved adolescents.[5] Funding for these projects totals $180,067,439, averaging approximately $120,000 per funded proposal.[6] Table 6 illustrates this spread over each of the 19 Federal agencies. The distribution of these projects encompassed the full range of target populations. What follows is a breakdown of two macro-categories of target groups: demographic characteristics and characteristics derived from other classifications.

---

[5] No category of target group is exclusive of any other category. These are frequencies of each category if mentioned specifically in the project's proposal.

[6] This figure is derived by dividing the total amount of funds by the total number of projects awarded funds in FY '74. This calculation excludes those projects which were continued in FY '74 without a new allocation of funds.

Table 6

Total Federal Research And Development Activity Involving Adolescents In FY '74, By Agency

Agency	# of Projects	%	Amount of Funds	%
DHEW				
OYD	16	(.8)	$ 906,645	(.5)
NICHD	69	(3.5)	3,707,444	(2.1)
NIMH	426	(21.7)	19,123,808	(10.6)
NIDA	75	(3.8)	6,768,407	(3.8)
NIAAA	12	(.6)	450,358	(.3)
NINDS	44	(2.2)	4,061,062	(2.3)
BCHS	23	(1.2)	1,237,991	(.7)
SRS	35	(1.8)	795,948	(.4)
NIE	329	(16.8)	44,859,713	(24.9)
OCD	49	(2.5)	5,476,331	(3.0)
Office of Education				
OPBE	22	(1.1)	2,162,326	(1.2)
BOAE	159	(8.1)	14,255,606	(7.9)
BEH	116	(5.9)	20,346,695	(11.3)
OIE	117	(6.0)	11,473,495	(6.4)
Right-To-Read	131	(6.7)	5,280,547	(2.9)
BSS	260	(13.2)	29,479,379	(16.4)
USDA	43	(2.2)	406,606	(.2)
DOL	32	(1.6)	1,238,702	(.7)
ACTION	5	(.3)	8,294,698	(4.6)
Adolescent Total	1,964	(63.0)[a]	$180,325,761	(63.0)[b]

[a] 1,964 is 63.0% of the 3,116 Federal projects on children or adolescents in FY '74.

[b] $180.1 million is 63.0% of the $303.3 million allocated by Federal projects on children or adolescents in FY '74.

Demographic Characteristics

Table 7 displays the first category, that of ascribed characteristics of the target population which were specifically mentioned in the project proposals. Thus, on the first line, 9.3% (N=289) of all the 3,116 Federal project proposals on nonadults specifically mentioned the inclusion of white adolescents in their target populations. In turn, these 289 projects which specified the inclusion of white adolescents, involved 8.2% of the total $303.3 million in Federal funds allocated to research and development on nonadults in FY '74. Of the 17 agencies funding projects specifying the inclusion of white adolescents in their target groups, the largest number of studies (N=103) was funded through the Right-To-Read Program within the Office of Education.

Similarly, adolescent females were mentioned as a target group in 3.6% of the Federal proposals, blacks in 8.3%, Orientals in .6%, Mexican-Americans in 2.3%, Puerto-Rican Americans in .8%, and Native American Indians in 5.7%. More than 14% of the Federal proposals specifically included urban adolescent populations, while 7.8% included those which were rural. Because of the active role of the Office of Indian Education, a relatively large portion of the Federal projects (2.8%) specifically included adolescent populations on Indian Reservations, while migratory labor populations were mentioned in a somewhat modest five projects (.2% of the Federal total), funded largely through the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education.

When only basic research is considered, the total number of projects which cite any adolescent target group characteristic diminishes from 1,950 to 276, a decrease of 85.8%. The percentage of Federal projects specifically including a white target group, for example, alters from 9.3 to 1.4, from 289 to 45 projects. Thus, of the 289 adolescent projects which mention a white target group, 45 (15.6%) were basic in research orientation. The smallest percentages of basic research were registered by those projects directed toward Native American Indians. Of the 176 funded proposals, 1.1%

---

[7] Because there were many proposals which could have involved these target groups but made no specific mention of them, these figures may not be the most accurate reflection of the actual flow of Federal activity toward these populations.

Table 7

Adolescent Target Population: Percentages of Demographic Characteristics Included In The Project Proposal, By Type Of Research

BASIC AND APPLIED RESEARCH

Adolescent Characteristic[c]	% of All Fed. Nonadult Projects[a]	(N)	% of All Fed. Nonadult Funds[b]	# of Funding Agencies	Agency Funding The Largest # of Projects
White	9.3	(289)	8.2	17	Right-To-Read N = 103
Female	3.6	(113)	1.7	17	NIMH N = 33
Black	8.3	(259)	8.7	15	Right-To-Read N = 85
Oriental	.6	(18)	1.0	9	Right-To-Read N = 4
Mexican-American	2.3	(72)	1.7	13	Right-To-Read N = 26
Puerto-Rican American	.8	(26)	1.9	8	Equal Ed & NIMH N = 5 Each
Native American	5.7	(176)	7.1	14	Indian Ed. N = 114
Urban	14.4	(449)	12.0	19	Right-To-Read N = 49
Ghetto	2.5	(79)	2.7	12	NIMH N = 25
Suburban	2.4	(76)	1.9	12	Right-To-Read N = 17
Rural	7.8	(243)	9.8	16	BOAE N = 43
Indian Reservation	2.8	(87)	2.9	8	Indian Ed. N = 75
Migrant Population	.2	(5)	.1	3	BOAE N = 3
Population Outside the U.S.	1.9	(58)	1.3	9	NIMH N = 25

[a] Total N = 3,116, the total number of research projects on early childhood and/or adolescence.

[b] Total Funds = $303.3 million supporting research projects on early childhood and adolescence.

[c] These characteristics are not mutually exclusive.

Table 7 (Continued)

BASIC RESEARCH ONLY

Adolescent Characteristic[c]	% of All Fed. Non-Adult Projects[a]	(N)	% of All Fed. Non-Adult Funds[b]	# of Funding Agencies	Agency Funding The Largest # of Projects
White	1.4	(45)	.7	10	NIMH N = 24
Female	1.6	(49	.8	11	NIMH N = 19
Black	1.5	(48)	.7	8	NIMH N = 25
Oriental	.1	(2)	.0	1	NIMH N = 2
Mexican-American	.3	(8)	.1	4	NIE N = 3
Puerto-Rican American	.1	(4)	.1	2	NIMH & NIDA N = 2 Each
Native American	.1	(2)	.0	2	NIE & NIMH N = 1 Each
Urban	1.9	(59)	.8	10	NIMH N = 26
Ghetto	.2	(6)	.0	1	NIMH N = 6
Suburban	.2	(6)	.2	4	NIMH N = 3
Rural	.7	(21)	.2	5	USDA N = 8
Indian Reservation	0	-	0	-	-
Migrant Population	0	-	0	-	-
Population Outside the U.S.	.8	(26)	.4	6	NIMH N = 12

[a] Total N = 3,116, the total number of research projects on early childhood and/or adolescence.

[b] Total Funds = $303.3 million supporting research projects on early childhood and adolescence.

[c] These characteristics are not mutually exclusive.

(N=2) were primarily for basic research while 98.9% were for other types of research and development activities, which would include demonstration, pilot, or evaluation studies. Both ghetto and suburban research registered similar proporations dedicated to basic research (7.6% and 7.9%), as did those for Mexican-Americans and Oriental Americans (both 11.1%). The largest percentage of basic research on adolescence is found in those projects designed to include adolescents outside the United States; of the 58 projects included in that category, 26 of them (44.8%) were for basic research purposes. A similarly high percentage of basic research was destined for projects including specifically female target groups: 43.4% (49 out of 113 projects).

Individual Characteristics: Physical Handicaps

As illustrated by Table 8, 149 projects in FY '74 were targeted for adolescents who had individual physical handicap problems. These projects involved 6.6% of all Federal research funds for nonadults across 12 agencies ranging from BCHS (Agency #7), to SRS (Agency #8), NIE (Agency #9) and OPBE (Agency #11). Of the 12 different funding agencies, BEH funded the largest number of studies (N=46), making up 30.9% of the total.

When broken down into aural, visual, neurological, orthopedical and speech projects involving adolescents, the neurological and the aural efforts make up the largest share of the activity. Accounting for 1.2% and 1.8% of all Federal monies invested in research and development on nonadults, the 91 projects in these two categories comprise over 60% of all activity in the field of physically handicapped.

When one looks at the basic research funded on physically handicapped adolescents, several patterns become evident. First, a higher proportion of research on physical handicaps was dedicated to basic research purposes than was the case for any of the demographic characteristics displayed in Table 7. Of the 146 projects which included physically handicapped adolescents in the target population, 27 (18.5%) were for basic research. Secondly, however, large differences in the proportion subscribed for basic research seem to exist within particular handicap problems. Visual and orthopedic projects were planned largely for applied purposes; only two out of 22 and one out of 14 were coded as basic research. On the other hand, of the 14 neurological projects, 12 (85.7%) were dedicated to purposes of basic research.

These were most commonly funded through NIMH; yet NIDA, NINDS, BCHS, and OCD all funded neurological projects as well.

Individual Characteristics: The Intellectually and Emotionally Handicapped and Others

Table 9 displays the same descriptive breakdown as did Table 8. From it one can see that the Federal government allocated 4.6% (143 projects) of its research on nonadults toward benefiting intellectually handicapped adolescents, 4.7% toward benefiting the emotionally handicapped adolescents, and the largest category on the Table, 6.2%, toward those adolescents who were judged to be slow in academic school work. Eighty-seven projects were directed at adolescent users of drugs. Of these, there were more projects specified for abusers of alcohol (N=18) than for either heroin (N=9) or marijuana (N=3). These activities directed toward helping adolescents, are spread across wide varieties of agencies. The 125 projects involving adolescent delinquents were funded by 11 agencies, as were the 28 projects involving adolescent parents, and the 71 involving school drop-outs.

In terms o[illegible]c research, several target group categories stand out. One out of two projects involving schizophrenics or marijuana users was oriented toward basic research purposes. For the emotionally handicapped it approximated one in four, as it did for projects involving adolescent parents and abusers of alcohol. High proportions of basic research also tended to be the case for those adolescents who were academically slow (one project in three) and those who used drugs in general (one in five), perhaps indicating the need for further testing in these areas before heavy investment in the institutionalization of delivery systems.

Section 4: Patterns of Federal Adolescent Research and Development Activity With Respect to Project Focus

Developmental Problems

Adolescent development is a fruitful subject for investigation. Seventeen out of the 19 Federal agencies sponsored at least one project in the area, and their efforts accounted for 6.2% of the money allocated for all

Table 8

Adolescent Target Population: Percentage of Federal Activity Involving the Physically Handicapped by Type of Research

BASIC AND APPLIED RESEARCH

Adolescent Characteristic[d]	% of All Fed. Nonadult Projects[a] (N)		% of All Fed. Nonadult Funds[b]	Funding Agencies[c]	Agency Funding the Largest # of Studies
Physically Handicapped Total	4.7	(146)	6.6	3,4,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,15,16	BEH N = 46
Aurally	1.6	(49)	1.8	3,6,7,8,9,11,12,13,15,16	NINDS N = 17
Visually	.7	(22)	.8	3,8,9,11,12,13,15,16	BEH N = 13
Neurologically	1.4	(42)	1.2	3,4,6,7,10,12,13,16	NIMH N = 19
Orthopedically	.5	(14)	.5	2,7,8,13,11,12	BEH N = 6
Speech	.7	(22)	.7	3,6,8,12,13,15,16	BEH N = 6

[a] Total N = 3,116

[b] Total Funds = $303.3 million

[c] Refer to Figure 2 on page 40 for agency code numbers.

[d] These categories are not mutually exclusive.

Table 8 (Continued)

BASIC RESEARCH ONLY

Adolescent Characteristic[d]	% of All Fed. Nonadult Projects[a] (N)	% of All Fed. Nonadult Funds[b]	Funding Agencies[c]	Agency Funding the Largest # of Studies
Physically Handicapped Total	.9 (27)	.9	3,4,6,7,8,9,10,13	NINDS N = 11
Aurally	.3 (9)	.3	6	NINDS N = 9
Visually	.1 (2)	.1	3,13	NIMH & BEH N = 1 each
Neurologically	.4 (12)	.4	3,4,6,7,10	NIMH N = 7
Orthopedically	.0 (1)	.0	7	BCHS N = 1
Speech	.1 (4)	.1	6,8,13	NINDS N = 2

[a] Total N = 3,116

[b] Total Funds = $303.3 million

[c] Refer to Figure 2 on page 40 for agency code numbers.

[d] These categories are not mutually exclusive.

Table 9

Adolescent Target Population: Percentage Of Federal Activity Involving The Intellectually And Emotionally Handicapped And Others, By Type Of Research

BASIC AND APPLIED RESEARCH

Adolescent Characteristics[a]	% of All Fed. Non-Adult Projects[b]	(N)	% of All Fed. Non-Adult Funds[c]	Funding Agencies[d]	Agency Funding The Largest # of Studies
Intellectually Handicapped Total	4.6	(143)	4.2	2,3,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16	BEH N = 57
Retarded	2.5	(78)	2.4	2,3,6,7,8,10,11,12,13,14,15,16	BEH N = 22
Learning Disabled	2.4	(76)	1.9	2,3,6,7,9,12,13,14,16	BEH N = 42
Emotionally Handicapped Total	4.7	(147)	2.9	3,5,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,16	NIMH N = 105
Schizophrenic	.9	(28)	.4	3,8,12	NIMH N = 26
Autism	.2	(7)	.2	3,10,12,16	NIMH N = 4
Drug Users	3.2	(101)	2.6	3,4,5,12,13,14,15,18	NIDA N = 60
Heroin	.3	(9)	.4	4,12	NIDA N = 8
Marijuana	.1	(4)	.1	4,5,12	NIDA N = 2
Alcohol	.6	(18)	.3	3,4,5,12,14	NIAAA N = 9
Delinquents	4.0	(125)	2.5	1,3,4,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,18	NIMH N = 98
Abused or Neglected	.5	(15)	.5	3,8,10,12,14,16	NIMH N = 6
Academically Slow	6.2	(194)	3.5	3,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,18	Right-To-Read N = 131
Drop-outs	2.3	(71)	3.9	3,4,7,9,11,12,13,14,15,16,18	Indian Education N = 31
Intellectually Gifted	.1	(5)	.1	14,16	NIE N = 12

[a] Categories are not mutually exclusive.

[b] Total N = 3,116

[c] Total Funds = $303.3 million

[d] Refer to Figure 2 on page 43 for agency code numbers.

Table 9 (Continued)

BASIC RESEARCH ONLY

Adolescent Characteristics[a]	% of All Fed. Non-Adult Projects[b]	(N)	% of All Fed. Non-Adult Funds[c]	Funding Agencies[d]	Agency Funding The Largest # of Studies
Intellectually Handicapped Total	.7	(23)	.5	2,3,6,8,9,10,13	NIMH N = 7
Retarded	.4	(12)	.4	2,3,6,8,10	NICHD & NIMH N = 4 Each
Learning Disabled	.3	(9)	.1	2,3,6,13	NINDS & NIMH N = 3 Each
Emotionally Handicapped Total	1.2	(36)	.6	3,5,9	NIMH N = 33
Schizophrenic	.5	(14)	.3	3	NIMH N = 14
Autism	.0	(1)	.1	3	NIMH N = 1
Drug Users	.6	(18)	.5	3,4,5	NIDA N = 12
Heroin	.0	(1)	.1	4	NIDA N = 1
Marijuana	.1	(2)	.0	4,5	NIDA & NIAAA N = 1 Each
Alcohol	.1	(4)	.1	3,5	NIAAA N = 3
Delinquents	.5	(14)	.1	3,8	NIMH N = 13
Abused or Neglected	0	0	0	0	0
Academically Slow	.2	(6)	.1	3,9,10	NIE N = 3
Drop-outs	.2	(7)	.1	3,9,16	NIE & NIMH N = 3 Each
Intellectually Gifted	.0	(0)	.0	6,9,13,18	NIE & NINDS N = 2 Each
Adolescent Parents	.0	-	.0	-	-

[a] Categories are not mutually exclusive.

[b] Total N = 3,116

[c] Total Funds = $303.3 million

[d] Refer to Figure 2 on page 43 for agency code numbers.

Federal research and development on nonadults. Table 10 illustrates this, and in addition, it breaks the term "development" down into the areas of physical, cognitive, and socioemotional. Of the three, socioemotional development problems appear as the largest category with 155 projects (5% of all Federal projects), but the category of physical development accounted for $2.3 million more in funding ($7.7 as opposed to $5.4 million).

When projects primarily focusing[8] upon adolescent development are essentially basic in research purpose, the total number of projects with this focus diminishes from 406 to 249. However, these 249 projects (60.3% of the 406) accounting for $11.3 million, symbolize the substantial commitment of the Federal government to basic research in this area. Yet even this 60.3% is only an average for developmental activity. Within the category of cognitive development, the 92 basic research projects accounted for 70.8% of all adolescent cognitive activity, an even higher percentage.

In Table 11, the pattern of activity on adolescent developmental problems is further broken down into nine specific areas.[9] Of these nine categories, most frequently utilized was the subject of academic achievement. Fourteen agencies funded studies involving the academic achievement of adolescents; these accounted for 12.9% of all Federal funds for research and development on nonadults. The 153 projects utilizing a measure of academic achievement outstrip the frequency of projects using intelligence measures (N=38), projects on language development (N=82), reading processes (N=56), sexual identity (N=25), and motivations (N=88). Of these same nine categories, the subject of self-concept was the second most frequently included. One hundred and forty-seven adolescent projects (4.7% of all Federal activity on nonadults) from 16 agencies, utilized a measure of self-concept in some way. Twenty of these adolescent projects (13.6%), funded by seven different agencies, focused primarily upon increasing basic knowledge about self-concept; the others included it within their projects for more instrumental reasons.

---

[8] These "primary subject focus" categories as in Table 7 are always mutually exclusive. As they are displayed in Tables 10 and 13, each project is fitted into only one descriptive lable. But in addition, the project's purpose as basic is also exclusive of any other "purpose," so those projects in the right hand columns of Tables 10 and 13 can be described as primarily focused upon one specific subject and also as "basic" in their research purpose.

[9] None of these nine are mutually exclusive.

Table 10

Federal Research and Development Projects Focusing Primarily Upon General Adolescent Development Problems by Type of Activity

	Basic and Applied Research and Development Activity			Basic Research Only		
	% of All Federal Nonadult Projects[a] (N)	% of All Federal Nonadult Funds[b] ($ in Millions)	# of Funding Agencies	% of All Federal Nonadult Projects[a] (N)	% of All Federal Nonadult Funds[b] ($ in Millions)	# of Funding Agencies
Adolescent Development Total	13.0 (406)	6.2 (18.8)	17	8.0 (249)	3.7 (11.3)	13
Physical Development[c]	3.2 (101)	2.6 (7.7)	9	1.8 (55)	1.5 (4.4)	8
Cognitive Development[c]	4.2 (130)	1.4 (4.2)	11	3.0 (92)	1.0 (3.0)	8
Socioemotional Development[c]	5.0 (155)	1.8 (5.4)	13	2.9 (91)	1.0 (3.0)	10

[a] Total N = 3,116

[b] Total Funds = $303.3 million

[c] Mutually exclusive categories.

When the proportion of basic research is isolated, in the last column in Table 11 from all other research purposes, the pattern of activity is further illuminated. Within the area of "interpersonal relations," 34.1% of the activity was focused primarily on the purposes of increasing our knowldge. In projects on language development and sexual identity involving adolescents, the proportions were 30.5% and 28.0% respectively. In the areas of academic achievement and self-concept, the proportions of basic research were considerably lower (13.7% and 13.6%), perhaps indicating that these areas were not frequently studied, but were often utilized as success criteria for the improvement of an ameliorative "delivery system" affecting adolescents. Of the nine developmental subject areas portrayed in Table 11, the lowest proportion dedicated to basic research purposes was in the categroy of intelligence. Only 7.9% of the activity involving intelligence was "basic" in nature. Thus, even though intelligence remains a concept on which there is substantial dispute over definition, measurement, and application, its importance as a measure of some kind is underscored by the fact that 92.1% of the Federal adolescence research and development activity involving intelligence utilized it as an independent and not a dependent variable.

Social Environment

Table 12 breaks down the social environment milieu into eight specific but non-exclusive categories. A fair amount of activity surrounds the parameters of youth in the employment market. Thirty-one adolescent projects involved employment practices, 17 involved job mobility, and 12 involved unemployment. In addition, new approaches to conceptions of adolescence might be evidenced by the seven projects involving youth culture, the 19 involving sex roles, the 15 on adolescent legal rights, and the 23 on geographical mobility.

Organizations, Schools, and Schooling

Table 13 breaks down organizations which affect adolescents into four mtuually exclusive categories: law enforcement, crisis services (for adolescent protection or advocacy), health, and educational institutions.

Table 11

Federal Research And Development Projects Involving Specific Adolescent Development Problems, By Type Of Activity

Adolescent Developmental Problems[d]	Basic And Applied Research And Development Activity			Basic Research Only[c]			% of Projects For Basic Research Purposes
	% of All Fed. Non-Adult Projects[a] (N)	% of All Fed. Non-Adult Funds[b] ($ In Millions)	# of Funding Agencies	% of All Fed. Non-Adult Projects[a] (N)	% of All Fed. Non-Adult Funds[b] ($ In Millions)	# of Funding Agencies	
Self-Concept	4.7 (147)	5.0 (15.2)	16	.6 (20)	.2 (.5)	7	13.6
Cultural/Racial Identity	1.2 (40)	2.1 (6.3)	9	.2 (7)	.0 (.08)	3	17.5
Interpersonal Relationships	2.8 (88)	1.8 (5.4)	14	.2 (30)	.9 (.7)	7	34.1
Motivation	4.0 (123)	3.1 (9.5)	16	1.0 (30)	.4 (1.1)	8	24.4
Intelligence	1.2 (38)	.8 (2.4)	7	.1 (3)	.1 (.2)	2	7.9
Language Development	2.6 (82)	1.9 (5.5)	13	.8 (25)	.3 (.9)	6	30.5
Reading Process	1.8 (56)	1.6 (4.9)	9	.2 (7)	.0 (.09)	3	12.5
Academic Achievement	4.9 (153)	4.3 (12.9)	14	.7 (21)	.3 (.8)	6	13.7
Sexual Identity	.8 (25)	.3 (.8)	4	.2 (7)	.1 (.2)	4	28.0

[a] Total N = 3,116

[b] Total Funds = $303.3 million

[c] Basic and primarily focused upon developmental problems

[d] Categories are not mutually exclusive.

Table 12

Research And Development Projects Relating To An Adolescent's Social Environment, By Type Of Activity

Adolescent Socioenvironmental Problems[d]	Basic And Applied Research And Development Activity					Basic Research Only[c]				
	% of All Fed. Non-Adult Projects[a]	(N)	% of All Fed. Non-Adult Funds[b]	($ In Millions)	# of Funding Agencies	% of All Fed. Non-Adult Projects[a]	(N)	% of All Fed. Non-Adult Funds[b]	($ In Millions)	# of Funding Agencies
Crime/Violence	.1	(4)	.1	(.1)	1	0	-	0	-	-
Unemployment	.4	(12)	.4	(1.2)	4	.1	(2)	.0	(.02)	2
Job Mobility	.6	(17)	.2	(.5)	4	.1	(2)	.0	(.5)	2
Geographical Mobility	.7	(23)	.2	(.7)	6	.1	(4)	.1	(.2)	3
Legal Rights	.5	(15)	.4	(1.1)	6	0	-	0	-	-
Sex Roles	.6	(19)	.6	(1.7)	4	.0	(.1)	.0	-	1
Employment Practices	1.0	(31)	1.8	(5.6)	3	.1	(4)	.0	(.02)	3
Youth Culture	.2	(7)	.1	(.4)		.0	(1)	0		1

[a] Total N = 3,116

[b] Total Funds = $303.3 million

[c] Basic and primarily focused upon social environmental problems

[d] Categories are not mutually exclusive.

Thirty-three projects involved law enforcement and delinquency prevention services. Sixty-three included those mostly small and informal organizations which serve to protect an adolescent at a time of personal crisis: running away from home or in search of immediate advice.

Of the four categories, educational institutions accounted for by far the most numerous projects (N=1,140) and the greatest amount of Federal funds ($ 133.6 million). Thus, of all activity primarily focused upon organizations which effect adolescents, educational institutions made up the highest percentage. They accounted for 36.6% of all nonadult projects and 44.0% of the funding. Further breaking down educational institutions for adolescents, there were 108 projects focused primarily upon vocational/technical schools, 85 upon post-secondary schools, and 209 upon secondary schools.

So crucial is the area of schools and schooling involving adolescents, that additional description of present Federal research and development activity in this area should be enlightening. Tables 14 and 15 divide schooling activities into three more specific but non-exclusive categories: educational personnel, teaching techniques, and curriculum. Of these three, educational curriculum received the most attention: 871 projects and $100.2 million, as opposed to the 591 projects and $78.5 million of teaching teachniques, and the 454 projects and $55.6 million involving personnel.

By pursuing these two tables, two strong tendencies can be substantiated. First, the new foci on alternatives to educational "tradition" is made evident by the very considerable activity on work experience, non-graded schools, open classrooms, and the curricular areas of environmental education and career education. For example, though the term "career education" only became distinguishable from vocational guidance, vocational and technical education, industrial arts education, or business education as recently as a few years ago,[10] its importance is underscored by the fact that 11 agencies took an active part in its research and development though 186 Federal projects in FY '74. A similar effort might be cited for the activity of the 11 agencies which supported the 24 projects in the area of work experience, committing themselves to $9.3 million in funding.

---

[10] See Anthony LaDuca and Lawrence J. Barnett, "Career Education: Program on a White Horse," New York University Education Quarterly (Spring, 1974), p. 6.

Table 13

Federal Research And Development Projects Focusing Primarily Upon Organizations Which Involve Adolescents, By Type Of Activity

Organizations Involving Adolescents[d]	Basic And Applied Research And Development Activity: % of All Fed. Non-Adult Projects[a] (N)	Basic And Applied Research And Development Activity: % of All Fed. Non-Adult Funds[b] ($ In Millions)	Basic And Applied Research And Development Activity: # of Funding Agencies	Basic Research Only[c]: % of All Fed. Non-Adult Projects[a] (N)	Basic Research Only[c]: % of All Fed. Non-Adult Funds[b] ($ In Millions)	Basic Research Only[c]: # of Funding Agencies
Law Enforcement and Delinquency Services	1.1 (33)	1.0 (2.7)	3	0 (1)	.1 (.25)	1
Crisis Services	2.0 (63)	1.4 (4.1)	8	.1 (2)	.1 (.25)	2
Health Institutions	7.1 (220)	5.0 (15.1)	13	.2 (6)	.1 (.3)	4
Educational Institutions	36.6 (1140)	44.0 (133.6)	16	1.8 (57)	.4 (.12)	9
Secondary	6.7 (209)	4.7 (14.1)	15	.3 (9)	0 (.1)	5
Post-Secondary	2.7 (85)	4.0 (12.2)	4	.3 (10)	0 (1.0)	4
Vocational/ Technical	3.5 (108)	4.9 (14.7)	8	.1 (3)	0 (.0)	2

[a] Total N = 3,116

[b] Total Funds = $303.3 million

[c] Basic and primarily focused upon organizations involving non-adults

[d] All categories are mutually exclusive.

Table 14

Federal Research And Development Relating To Educational Personnel And Teaching Techniques Affecting Adolescents

Personnel and Techniques For Adolescent Education[a]	% of All Fed. Non-Adult Projects[b]	(N)	% of All Fed. Non-Adult Funds[c]	($ In Millions)	# Of Funding Agencies
Educational Personnel	14.6	(454)	18.3	(55.6)	15
Teacher Trainees	.7	(24)	.7	(2.1)	8
Administrators	.8	(25)	2.6	(8.0)	7
Teachers	12.0	(374)	15.4	(47.1)	12
Para-Professionals	3.0	(92)	4.2	(12.6)	8
Teaching Techniques[d]	19.0	(591)	25.6	(78.5)	18
Bilingual Education	1.8	(56)	3.1	(9.5)	8
Computer Education	1.4	(44)	1.2	(3.8)	7
TV Education	1.4	(41)	5.8	(17.6)	8
Open Classroom	1.4	(41)	1.1	(3.4)	8
Non-Graded Schools	.5	(14)	.2	(.7)	4
Team Teaching	1.0	(29)	2.8	(8.6)	6
Work Experience	.8	(24)	3.1	(9.3)	11

[a] None of these categories are exclusive of any other category

[b] Total N = 3,116

[c] Total Funding = $303.3 million

[d] These figures do not include the 310 projects involving $59.4 million funded through the Office of Bilingual Education within the Bureau of School Systems whose proposals were not available during the period of our data collection.

TABLE 15

Federal Research And Development Relating To Educational Curriculum Involving Adolescents

Adolescent Curricula[a]	% of All Fed. Non-Adult Projects[b]	(N)	% of All Fed. Non-Adult Funds[c]	($ In Millions)	# of Funding Agencies
Educational Curriculum	28.0	(871)	33.0	(100.2)	17
Math	2.8	(87)	4.7	(14.1)	7
Social Studies	1.0	(31)	1.9	(5.6)	7
Language Arts	9.2	(285)	10.1	(30.6)	9
Art/Music	1.5	(45)	1.6	(4.9)	7
Science	.9	(27)	2.0	(5.9)	7
Vocational Ed.	5.9	(182)	8.5	(25.7)	11
Career Ed.	6.0	(186)	10.2	(31.0)	11
Physical Ed.	.7	(21)	.5	(1.6)	5
Health Ed.	.6	(19)	.9	(2.8)	8
Drug Abuse Ed.	1.3	(40)	1.1	(3.4)	6
Sex Ed.	.3	(7)	.4	(1.2)	4
Environmental Ed.	2.3	(69)	1.7	(5.2)	6
Citizenship Training	2.1	(63)	1.4	(4.4)	8
Ed. for Parenthood	1.5	(46)	1.4	(4.2)	11

[a] None of these categories are exclusive of any other category

[b] Total N = 3,116

[c] Total Funding = $303.3 million

Second, as in a number of other categories, the research and development activity on schools seems to display the involvement of the broadest possible spectrum of Federal structures. Eighteen agencies were actively engaged in supporting experiments with new teaching techniques, 17 with new curriculum, and 15 with personnel. The current role that schools play in the institutionalization of efforts to influence adolescents is evidenced by the seriousness with which all agencies treat them as organizations. Compared to the original hesitancies which attended the early Federal efforts in the 1950's, these data indicate precisely how far the trend has evolved toward the normalization of Federal research and development within locally-controlled schools. This has, for all intents and purposes, become a necessary factor for the healthy development of American education. Given the fact that the central government structure in every other major industrial democracy performs a similar role, the activities of the 19 Federal agencies described here should hardly be other than encouraged in their creative assistance.

CHAPTER IV

PATTERNS OF AGENCY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ON ADOLESCENCE: THEIR MISSIONS, ACTIVITY IN FY '74, AND LEVELS OF INTEREST FOR FY '75

Introduction

In the following chapter the activities within individual agencies are broken down into four groups. First, the focus of each is compacted into a brief "Mission" statement, the substance of which derives from legislative mandates. Within FY '74, each agency's activity is then described along two dimensions: (1) its project characteristics (categories of funding, type of research and development, and its usage of methodologies) and (2) its primary research foci. These two dimensions are displayed for each agency with two tables. Lastly, each agency's plans for the next fiscal year, that of FY '75, are summarized into one or two paragraphs. The basis for this statement is educed from a questionnaire sent to each agency and returned by an individual with knowledge of his agency's intentions. A summary of these FY '75 "levels of interest" can be found as an appendix.

OFFICE OF YOUTH DEVELOPMENT, OFFICE OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT, DHEW

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $.9 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 16

Mission

The Office of Youth Development mission is to effect the coordination and institutional changes required to create a climate conducive to favorable youth development for all youth, with emphasis on delinquency prevention. OYD has three programmatic components: (1) the Division of Youth Services System which administers the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1972; (2) the Division of Youth Activities which serves as the Federal government's spokesman for youth activities; and (3) part of the effort to address the problem of youths who run away from home. In FY '74 OYD's program resources and evaluation funds focused on the Youth Services System program. The purpose was to stimulate development of coordinated services of public and private agencies and enhance the capacity of states and communities to meet more effectively the critical needs of youth.

R&E Efforts. The OYD R&E effort will be directed toward providing a credible base of information on youth, on impediments to youth development, on gaps in services, and on evaluations of selected programs and services. Specifically, OYD will attempt to utilize existing statistical source data, a runaway survey, evaluation of runaway programs, analysis of Federal youth programs and descriptive research of selected models for youth development. This is policy relevant information that can give direction to planning for program, legislation, and inter-intra-departmental planning for youth.

Fiscal Year '74

The Office of Youth Development funded 15 grant and one contract projects, mostly on applied research, in FY '74. Approximately one-third (five projects) involved clinical techniques, one was a case study, while two involved the use of observational methodologies. None of the proposals specifically

OYD

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $.9 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 16

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	1	$ 0	6.3
Physical Development	0	0	0
Cognitive Development	0	0	0
Socioemotional Development	1	0	6.3
Family	0	0	0
Neighborhood	0	0	0
Social Change	0	0	0
Health/Welfare Services	2	51,014	12.5
Educational Institutions	6	260,034	37.5
Secondary School	2	69,227	12.5
Post-Secondary School	2	190,807	12.5
Vocational/Technical Schools	0	0	0
Law Enforcement	7	626,611	0
The Research Process	0	0	0

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

OYD

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $.9 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 16

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	1	$ 94,111	6.3
Grant	15	812,534	93.8
Intramural	0	0	0
TYPE OF R, D & E[b]			
Basic Research	0	0	0
Applied Research	14	812,534	87.5
Evaluation	2	94,111	12.5
Research on Planning	0	0	0
Research Support Activities	0	0	0
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	5	260,807	31.3
Case Study	1	60,000	6.3
Survey Techniques	0	0	0
Observational Techniques	2	0	12.5
Interview Techniques	1	60,000	6.3
Use of Questionnaires	0	0	0

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research, development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

mentioned the use of questionnaires or survey analytic techniques. Of these 16 studies, seven primarily concerned law enforcement issues, six educational institutions, two health or welfare services, and one adolescent development.

Planning For Fiscal Year '75

In FY '75, the Office of Youth Development will focus their research and evaluation efforts increasingly upon the problems of youths who have run away from their homes. It will increase its attention to counseling them and their families, analyzing survey data, improving program evaluation methods, statistical techniques, and methods to improve interstudy comparability. In addition, a low level of attention will continue with respect to sexually abused adolescents, unwed adolescent mothers, venereal and other diseases and institutional barriers to youth development.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH, DHEW

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $3.7 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 69

Mission

NICHD supports research in the basic processes of human development including those involved in social and behavioral development, as well as the biomedical processes. The recently expanded research program on adolescent growth and development includes five areas of emphasis: the biological process, nutrition, intellectual development, socialization, and endocrinological and psychological development.

Fiscal Year '74

The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development concentrated approximately 80% of its adolescence research and development activity on basic research projects. Eighty-four percent (58 projects) were funded through grants and 15.9% (11 projects) through contracts. Twenty-one percent employed some form of survey analytic techniques. As the breakdown by primary research focus indicates, the majority of the agency's activity (38 projects) focused primarily upon physical and cognitive development. When 14 of the projects which focused upon socioemotional development are included, the emphasis upon development accounted for 76.8% of its adolescence projects and over three million of its $3.7 million adolescence funds.

NICHD

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $3.7 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 69

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	53	$3,161,589	76.8
Physical Development	17	1,124,160	24.6
Cognitive Development	21	1,146,811	30.4
Socioemotional Development	14	885,077	20.3
Family	7	264,507	10.1
Neighborhood	1	32,093	1.5
Social Change	6	199,965	8.7
Health/Welfare Services	2	49,290	2.9
Educational Institutions	0	0	0
Secondary School	0	0	0
Post-Secondary School	0	0	0
Vocational/Technical Schools	0	0	0
Law Enforcement	0	0	0
The Research Process	0	0	0

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

NICHD

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

- Funding of Adolescence, R, D, D, & E: $3.7 million
- Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 69

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	11	$ 519,654	15.9
Grant	58	3,235,421	84.1
Intramural	0	0	0
TYPE OF R, D & E[b]			
Basic Research	55	3,063,990	79.7
Applied Research	13	643,454	18.8
Evaluation	1	0	1.5
Research on Planning	0	0	0
Research Support Activities	0	0	0
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	5	283,297	7.3
Case Study	6	279,528	8.7
Survey Techniques	21	1,081,551	30.4
Observational Techniques	6	220,422	8.7
Interview Techniques	11	368,440	15.9
Use of Questionnaires	14	756,406	20.3

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research, development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

Plans For Fiscal Year '75

No major shifts in emphasis should occur over handicap problems within NICHD. Low involvement will continue in the areas of bilingual learning problems, run-aways, autism or adolescents who have been diagnosed as having orthopedically, visually or aurally handicapping problems. Relatively high involvement will continue to surround the areas of speech problems, and those who are retarded, academically slow or learning disabled.

An increment in activity in FY '75 may be shown in the area of abused or neglected adolescents. No alternations should occur over emphasis among differing ascriptive target population characteristics with relatively equal concern being shown between blacks, whites, Spanish-speaking Americans, and those who live in rural, urban or suburban areas.

Very high attention will continue to be placed within all the areas of development: cognitive, physical (body growth) and social (personality, emotional and behavior). High interest will also continue in understanding the influences of family structure and family functions and the social/cultural environment on adolescents. Important note should be made of a decrease in emphasis which may be shown with respect to investigating the influences of the physical environment upon adolescents.

Low emphasis will continue with respect to psychotherapy and psychological counseling. No changes should occur in the interest in methodology or over which methodologies are most prevalent. Sociological, psychological, and biological remain the highest, followed by the approaches of anthropology, later political science, and lastly, history.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH, ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION, DHEW

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $19.1 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 425

Mission

The objectives of the research program of NIMH are to support research on the etiology, diagnosis, treatment, prevention, and control of mental illness, and the promotion of mental health. NIMH is primarily responsible, therefore, for the support of applied, clinical and basic research aimed either at the resolution of specific problems of mental and emotional illness, or at the augmenting of knowledge regarding human behavior. Areas of study which relate to adolescents include the process of occupational choice, sex role development, preparation for family roles, the understanding of the problems contributing to crime and delinquency, and the means of treating these problems.

Fiscal Year '74

One-half of the projects within NIMH were principally funded for applied purposes, 39% for basic, and 6% for evaluation reasons. Though less than three percent of the total number of adolescent projects, 11 were intramurally funded, 44 (10%) utilized clinical settings, and 93 (22%) observational techniques. There were more case studies (16) than in any other agency, except NIE. Almost 20% of the total 425 adolescence projects were investigations principally of socioemotional development. Developmental problems accounted for 44% of the agency's adolescence projects, outranking the 104 (25%) which focused primarily upon health and welfare services, the 39 (9%) on educational institutions and the 24 (5.7%) on problems of law enforcement.

NIMH

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $19.1 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 425

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	186	$6,509,775	43.8
Physical Development	29	1,833,899	6.8
Cognitive Development	60	1,616,041	14.1
Socioemotional Development	84	2,279,945	19.8
Family	40	2,001,439	9.4
Neighborhood	6	444,642	1.4
Social Change	15	465,593	3.5
Health/Welfare Services	104	5,447,749	24.5
Educational Institutions	39	1,893,116	9.2
Secondary School	7	344,071	1.7
Post-Secondary School	13	830,640	3.1
Vocational/Technical Schools	1	70,485	.2
Law Enforcement	24	1,845,559	5.7
	11	456,535	2.6
The Research Process			

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

NIMH

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $19.1 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 425

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	58	$ 2,190,491	13.7
Grant	356	16,873,647	83.8
Intramural	11	0	2.6
TYPE OF R, D & E[b]			
Basic Research	166	6,281,879	39.1
Applied Research	213	11,461,345	50.1
Evaluation	26	1,036,278	6.3
Research on Planning	3	34,798	.7
Research Support Activities	17	249,881	41.
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	44	3,152,365	10.4
Case Study	16	605,682	3.8
Survey Techniques	61	2,343,329	14.4
Observational Techniques	93	4,758,375	21.9
Interview Techniques	115	5,273,706	27.1
Use of Questionnaires	95	3,686,208	22.4

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research, development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

Plans For Fiscal Year '75

The Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency within the National Institute of Mental Health will continue to concentrate its highest attention on studies of adolescent delinquents, behavior problems, and the influence of the social/cultural environment. Medium or low attention will continue with respect to abused or neglected adolescents, cognitive decision-making, family functions and special school programs for delinquency and related behavior problems. High attention will continue to focus upon the development of methods for evaluation, observation, research designs and applicable techniques of statistics with a sociological or psychological emphasis.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DRUG ABUSE
ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION, DHEW

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $6.8 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 75

Mission

The National Institute of Drug Abuse supports research and demonstration projects designed to investigate the nature and extent of drug use problems, to compare various treatment methods, and to improve the efficiency of treatment for the young drug user. In addition, research in prevention and education is supported by the expansion of methodological applications beyond the more traditional approaches.

Fiscal Year '74

Though 61% of NIDA's 75 research projects affecting adolescence was applied in nature, other categories were also well encouraged. Twenty percent (15 projects) were allocated toward primarily a basic research focus, 11% (8 projects) for evaluation research, 5% on research support activities and 3% to research on planning. Higher utilization was made of survey, questionnaire and interview techniques than any others. Most projects were primarily focused upon health and welfare services (58%), but significant efforts were placed upon schools (11%), physical development problems (7%), and socioemotional problems (.15%).

NIDA

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $6.8 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 75

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	18	$1,979,507	24.0
Physical Development	5	1,196,791	6.7
Cognitive Development	1	90,140	1.3
Socioemotional Development	11	559,178	14.7
Family	2	273,581	2.7
Neighborhood	0	0	0
Social Change	2	0	2.7
Health/Welfare Services	44	3,751,483	58.7
Educational Institutions	8	763,836	10.7
Secondary School	4	237,397	5.3
Post-Secondary School	0	0	0
Vocational/Technical Schools	0	0	0
Law Enforcement	0	0	0
The Research Process	1	0	1.3

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

NIDA

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $6.8 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 75

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	17	$1,490,277	22.7
Grant	58	5,278,130	77.3
Intramural	0	0	0
TYPE OF R, D & E[b]			
Basic Research	15	1,687,203	20.0
Applied Research	46	4,225,609	61.3
Evaluation	8	512,957	10.7
Research on Planning	2	234,884	2.7
Research Support Activities	4	107,754	5.3
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	5	261,052	6.7
Case Study	3	249,227	4.0
Survey Techniques	10	1,428,338	13.3
Observational Techniques	1	381,422	1.3
Interview Techniques	20	2,386,619	26.7
Use of Questionnaires	24	2,101,862	32.0

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

Plans For Fiscal Year '75

The FY '75 research of the National Institute of Drug Abuse which affects adolescents will continue to center around the use and the abuse of marijuana, heroin, non-opiate and multiple drugs. Strong interest relating to drugs will continue to be shown with respect to adolescent parents, socioemotional aspects of behavior, physical disease, the social environment, drug education, psychotherapy and vocational training. In addition there should be evidence of higher attention in FY '75 being paid to methodological questions of evaluation, observation survey analysis, self-concepts, and methods of improvement for inter-study comparability.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM
ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION, DHEW

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $.4 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 12

Mission

The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) has two principal objectives: (1) to make treatment and rehabilitative services available to alcoholic people and problem drinkers by mobilizing existing resources at the Federal, State and local level and developing a broad range of community alcoholism treatment and rehabilitative programs; (2) to develop a program which would pursue new methods for preventing the abuse and misuse of alcoholic beverages and the testing and evaluating of the effectiveness of these methods.

The concerns within the Division of Prevention research will include investigations of the impact of a wide variety of factors--social, psychological, physical, economic, legal and educational--upon people's drinking patterns. In addition, studies on the etiologies of alcoholism would clarify the different roles that genetics, culture, health, and quality of life play in the development of this illness. Youth have been identified as the primary target group for many of these studies. A major programmatic direction of this division is through the Youth Education Branch. This section supports demonstration projects designed to encourage responsibility in the use of alcohol and develops and tests new youth programs for alcohol education. A second programmatic interest, channelled through the Community Prevention Branch, has as its goal the development of effective health education programs relating to alcohol abuse for the whole community population, which also would include youth.

Fiscal Year '74

NIAAA supported 12 research projects which included the involvement of adolescents. Rather widely divided between basic (5 projects) and applied research (7 projects), and between contracts (4 projects) and grants

NIAAA

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $.4 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 12

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	6	$259,381	50.0
Physical Development	0	0	0
Cognitive Development	0	0	0
Socioemotional Development	6	259,381	50.0
Family	0	0	0
Neighborhood	0	0	0
Social Change	1	52,274	8.3
Health/Welfare Services	2	0	16.7
Educational Institutions	3	97,765	25.0
Secondary School	1	0	8.3
Post-Secondary School	0	0	0
Vocational/Technical Schools	0	0	0
Law Enforcement	0	0	0
The Research Process	0	0	0

---

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

NIAAA

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $.4 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 12

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	4	$145,230	33.3
Grant	8	264,190	66.7
Intramural	0	0	0
TYPE OF R, [illegible] E[b]			
Basic Research	5	221,916	41.6
Applied Research	7	187,504	58.3
Evaluation	0	0	0
Research on Planning	0	0	0
Research Support Activities	0	0	0
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	0	0	0
Case Study	0	0	0
Survey Techniques	5	201,085	41.7
Observational Techniques	1	40,919	8.3
Interview Techniques	4	234,701	33.3
Use of Questionnaires	4	148,811	33.3

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

(8 projects), in addition, the effort seemed dispersed in its foci of research. Six projects (50%) were concentrated primarily upon the problems surrounding socioemotional development. Three projects focused upon schools, two upon health and welfare services, and one upon investigating various aspects of social change which involved adolescents and the problem of alcohol abuse. The investigations mentioned almost exclusive use of survey, interview, and questionnaire techniques.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES AND STROKE
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH, DHEW

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $4.1 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 44

Mission

The National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke (NINDS) acknowledges a special mission to further both basic and applied research in the neurological and communicative disorders relating to adolescents. Areas of research relating to adolescents include: patterns of electroencephalographs of adolescents, language development, and thought processes, head trauma and stroke, and infectious diseases.

Fiscal Year '74

The NINDS research on adolescence relies heavily upon the use of clinical techniques. Fully 40% of the agency's 44 adolescence projects involved clinical methods, more than any other agency. Therefore, it follows that infrequent mention of survey techniques and questionnaires could be found in NINDS proposals. Research in FY '74 was rather evenly divided between basic (46%) and applied (55%) and between contracts (36%) and grants (54%). Three-fourths of the research involved development, usually physical, while one-fourth primarily concerned the utility of health and welfare services.

Plans for Fiscal Year '75

The NINDS will maintain its long-standing concern for the physical. Though some activity will surround the areas of aural and neurological handicap problems, cognitive and language development, its central goal will continue to pursue the understanding of physical and infectious diseases, head trauma and stroke. Its highest methodological concern will remain biological.

NINDS

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

- Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $4.1 million
- Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 44

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	32	$3,252,388	72.73
Physical Development	26	2,882,828	59.09
Cognitive Development	6	369,560	13.64
Socioemotional Development	0	0	0
Family	0	0	0
Neighborhood	0	0	0
Social Change	0	0	0
Health/Welfare Services	11	808,674	25.0
Educational Institutions	0	0	0
Secondary School	0	0	0
Post-Secondary School	0	0	0
Vocational/Technical Schools	0	0	0
Law Enforcement	0	0	0
The Research Process	1	0	0

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

NINDS

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $4.1 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 44

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	16	$1,451,422	36.36
Grant	28	2,609,640	53.64
Intramural	0	0	0
TYPE OF R, D & E[b]			
Basic Research	20	1,709,407	45.45
Applied Research	24	2,351,655	54.55
Evaluation	0	0	0
Research on Planning	0	0	0
Research Support Activities	0	0	0
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	18	1,937,395	40.91
Case Study	9	1,434,914	20.45
Survey Techniques	2	0	4.55
Observational Techniques	2	227,494	4.55
Interview Techniques	0	0	0
Use of Questionnaires	1	0	2.27

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

BUREAU OF COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES
HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, DHEW

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $1.2 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 23

Mission

The purpose of the BCHS, Maternal and Child Health and Crippled Children's Services Research Grants program is to support scientific studies that show promise of improving the operation, functioning, general usefulness, and effectiveness of health services for mothers and children. Special concern in the area of adolescent research is placed on health services to pregnant teenagers.

Fiscal Year '74

All of the 23 BCHS studies affecting adolescents through the Maternal and Child Health Services research arm were made on a grant basis; most had applied research purposes but there were three which focused upon research dissemination and utilization. The distribution of methodologies was quite evenly spread: six proposals mentioned the intention of using questionnaire and interview techniques, three utilized a clinical setting, one observational, and there was one case study.

The two most numerous categories of project foci seemed to be the delivery of adolescent health and welfare services (35%) and investigations of adolescent development (39%) particularly in physical development (21%). However. in addition, like many other agencies acting to improve the lives of adolescents, important emphasis was placed upon educational institutions (13%).

BCHS

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $1.2 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 23

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	9	$267,833	39.1
Physical Development	5	193,414	21.7
Cognitive Development	1	0	4.4
Socioemotional Development	1	56,609	4.4
Family	1	61,751	4.4
Neighborhood	0	0	0
Social Change	0	0	0
Health/Welfare Services	8	466,904	34.8
Educational Institutions	3	99,888	13.0
Secondary School	1	0	4.4
Post-Secondary School	1	42,347	4.4
Vocational/Technical Schools	0	0	0
Law Enforcement	0	0	0
The Research Process	2	341,615	8.7

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

BCHS

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $1.2 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 23

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	0	$ 0	0
Grant	23	1,237,991	100.0
Intramural	0	0	0
TYPE OF R, D & E[b]			
Basic Research	3	44,496	13.0
Applied Research	15	833,596	65.2
Evaluation	1	0	4.4
Research on Planning	1	71,434	4.4
Research Support Activities	3	288,465	13.0
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	3	119,292	13.0
Case Study	1	0	4.4
Survey Techniques	4	220,245	17.4
Observational Techniques	1	61,751	4.4
Interview Techniques	6	281,459	26.1
Use of Questionnaires	6	353,439	26.1

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

Plans For Fiscal Year '75

The BCHS will remain very interested in how the use of the drugs heroin and marijuana affect the outcomes of adolescent pregnancies. In addition, language development for the deaf, nutritional problems, knowledge, attitudes and behavior surrounding physiological development, and the availability and utilization of health services will be the subjects of focused attention in FY '75. No major alterations should be expected with respect to the distribution of interest regarding their agency target groups or their methodologies.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE, DHEW

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $.8 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 35

Mission

The goal of SRS research efforts as set forth in the Social Security Act and the Vocational and Rehabilitation Act is to discover, test, demonstrate and promote the utilization of new social and rehabilitation service concepts which will provide service to dependent and vulnerable populations: the poor, the handicapped, the aged, and children and youth.

Fiscal Year '74

All of the 35 SRS projects in the field of adolescence were made on a grant basis in FY '74. Unlike many other agencies, the most frequently utilized methodological category centered in a clinical setting (37%). The majority of projects focused primarily on the delivery of health or welfare services, but there appeared to be almost a uniquely divided interest between adolescent physical development (four projects), cognitive development (three projects) and socioemotional development (three projects). In addition there seemed to be a strong concern over research and development of vocational/technical schools (four projects).

Plans For Fiscal Year '75

In FY '75, the SRS will maintain a strong interest in investigating the best ways to serve youth who run away from home as well as the abused or neglected adolescents. Attention will continue with respect to young adolescents who have abused drugs and who have become parents. The most serious efforts will continue to focus upon various aspects of poverty. However, increments should be evident with respect to on-the-job skill development, birth control, program evaluation methods (operations and systems analysis research), research designs, statistical techniques and methods to improve comparability.

SRS

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $.8 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 35

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	10	$ 0	28.6
Physical Development	4	0	11.4
Cognitive Development	3	0	8.6
Socioemotional Development	3	0	8.6
Family	0	0	0
Neighborhood	0	0	0
Social Change	0	0	0
Health/Welfare Services	18	733,389	51.4
Educational Institutions	7	62,559	20
Secondary School	0	0	0
Post-Secondary School	1	0	2.7
Vocational/Technical Schools	4	0	11.4
Law Enforcement	0	0	0
The Research Process	0	0	0

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

SRS

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $.8 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 35

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	0	$ 0	0
Grant	35	795,948	100.0
Intramural	0	0	0
TYPE OF R, D & E[b]			
Basic Research	5	2,658	14.3
Applied Research	26	635,290	74.3
Evaluation	4	158,000	11.4
Research on Planning	0	0	0
Research Support Activities	0	0	0
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	13	62,559	37.1
Case Study	5	252,762	14.3
Survey Techniques	2	452,731	5.7
Observational Techniques	5	202,627	14.3
Interview Techniques	8	452,731	22.9
Use of Questionnaires	4	452,731	11.4

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research, development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION, DHEW

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $44.9 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 329

Mission

The NIE mandate requires that the agency provide leadership in the conduct and support of scientific inquiry into the education process. This is being accomplished by dividing the activity into five areas: Basic Skills; Education and Work; Finance, Productivity and Management; Education and Equity; and Dissemination. (1) Basic Skills. The Institute's purpose in this area is to improve children's ability to comprehend what they read. (2) Education and Work. Activities in this area have the goals of helping students: (a) make better choices in their careers; (b) improve their mastery of skills needed to enter and progress in jobs; and (c) leave and re-enter occupational education throughout their lives. (3) Finance, Productivity and Management. The prupose of work in this area is to ensure that the nation has a continuing ability to meet its commitment to quality education at a price it can afford. (4) Education and Equity. The Institute has established a program which addresses the needs of particular groups who face educational barriers. These groups are children from homes where the predominant language is not English, women, children from minority ethnic backgrounds and low income groups. (5) Dissemination. The purpose of this area is to direct information, often through State Departments of Education, local and intermediate school districts, and professional educational associations, so that it becomes available for use by teachers and administrators.

Fiscal Year '74

Though the National Institute of Education funded no adolescence intramural studies, much of what it did sponsor was widely distributed between very divergent means, methodologies, and subjects. Between the one-third contracts

NIE

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $44.9 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 329

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	44	$ 1,463,518	13.4
Physical Development	3	254,730	.9
Cognitive Development	30	605,402	9.1
Socioemotional Development	10	553,654	3.0
Family	6	113,656	1.9
Neighborhood	1	0	.3
Social Change	6	32,521	1.9
Health/Welfare Services	0	0	0
Educational Institutions	251	42,005,740	76.3
Secondary School	25	1,349,404	7.6
Post-Secondary School	30	1,588,207	9.1
Vocational/Technical Schools	35	9,171,262	10.6
Law Enforcement	0	0	0
The Research Process	21	1,244,278	6.4

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

NIE

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $44.9 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 329

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	110	$28,404,725	33.4
Grant	219	16,454,988	66.6
Intramural	0	0	0
TYPE OF R, D & E[b]			
Basic Research	76	1,418,304	23.1
Applied Research	178	39,289,002	54.1
Evaluation	33	1,789,581	10.0
Research on Planning	23	763,729	7.0
Research Support Activities	19	1,599,096	5.8
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	1	0	.3
Case Study	18	1,046,210	5.5
Survey Techniques	43	1,279,630	13.1
Observational Techniques	26	644,505	7.9
Interview Techniques	48	1,701,803	14.6
Use of Questionnaires	3	204,111	18.8

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research, development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

and two-thirds grants, 54% of the NIE's 329 projects were channelled toward applied research, 23% toward basic research and 10% toward evaluation research. Among methodologies, interview and survey techniques were most frequently mentioned in project proposals, followed less frequently by the usage of observation or case studies. Seventy-six percent of all the agency's adolescence projects focused primarily upon educational institutions. In addition, there appeared to be an extraordinarily strong interest in cognitive development not primarily focused within a school (30 projects), and investigations of the research process itself (21 projects).

Plans For Fiscal Year '75

The NIE will maintain its presently low profile with respect to both the physically and the emotionally handicapped. Similarly, within the area of the intellectual handicapping problems, its level of activity concerning adolescents who are retarded or who have learning disabilities will remain at a low or a medium level. As has been the case in FY '74, moderately high effort will continue to surround problems of those who are academically slow and those who drop out of school. FY '75 should show a higher interest in the area of bilingual education than in FY '74.

Relatively higher concentrations of effort will be placed upon youths who are members of minorities, live in urban areas or who are economically disadvantaged, than upon white or suburban youths. But this is not a change from FY '74. Also consistent with FY '74, very high attention will be paid to the areas of adolescent cognitive development--especially in the problem area of language development but less so in the area of thought processes. Moderate activity will continue with respect to projects concerning adolescent socio-emotional development, the influence of family interaction, the local neighborhood or mass media. More interest will continue to be shown on remedial reading than upon such problems as hyperkinesia. Medium activity will continue to be funded for innovative education within schools but higher levels of activity will continue with respect to alternatives to schools, work experience, career education, and on-the-job skill development. In comparison to other agencies, the NIE will continue to maintain the relatively high degree of activity on basic research which would employ the social science disciplines of history (analysis of precendent), sociology, and political science in addition to that of psychology.

OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT,
OFFICE OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY, DHEW

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $5.5 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 49

Mission

The Office of Child Development advises within the Federal government on matters pertaining to the care and development of children and assists in the development of national policies and programs which have a significant impact on the well-being of children and their families. Through activities such as the development of model legislation and standards, the provision of technical assistance, and the conduct of demonstration projects, OCD seeks to stimulate institutional changes at the Federal, State and local levels in order to improve the delivery of services to children and families, particularly those children and families who are most at risk due to economic disadvantage or other vulnerabilities. Research which can include children in the age range represented in this report is directed at the needs of particular populations of vulnerable children such as the abused or neglected, children in foster care, children in need of adoptive homes, and children in institutions.

Fiscal Year '74

Forty-seven of OCD's 49 projects which involved adolescence were made on a grant basis. Though heavy emphasis was placed upon applied research, all identified categories of research methodologies were utilized, including clinical studies (2 projects), case studies (3 projects) and observational techniques (5 projects). One-fourth of the agency's adolescence activity dealt with development, with the largest portion of that category concentrating on social and emotional problems. An additional fourth of the studies centered upon schools, while a third of all activity primarily focused upon health and welfare services. Two additional adolescence projects primarily revolved around the problems of the research process itself.

OCD

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $5.5 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 49

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	12	$1,215,573	24.5
Physical Development	1	145,849	2.0
Cognitive Development	1	79,378	2.0
Socioemotional Development	5	438,481	10.2
Family	6	423,968	12.2
Neighborhood	0	0	0
Social Change	1	73,392	2.0
Health/Welfare Services	16	1,508,860	32.7
Educational Institutions	12	2,162,734	24.5
Secondary School	9	1,911,078	18.4
Post-Secondary School	0	0	0
Vocational/Technical Schools	0	0	0
Law Enforcement	0	0	0
The Research Process	2	151,802	4.1

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

OCD

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $5.5 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 49

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	2	0	4.1
Grant	47	5,472,136	95.9
Intramural	0	0	0
TYPE OF R, D & E[b]			
Basic Research	15	1,531,918	30.6
Applied Research	23	3,223,873	46.9
Evaluation	3	315,621	6.1
Research on Planning	0	0	0
Research Support Activities	8	400,724	16.3
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	2	409,266	4.1
Case Study	3	285,956	6.1
Survey Techniques	10	706,066	20.4
Observational Techniques	5	650,556	10.2
Interview Techniques	14	1,293,501	28.6
Use of Questionnaires	10	875,085	20.4

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research, development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

Plans For Fiscal Year '75

OCD will remain concerned about a wide variety of intellectual handicaps: those adolescents who are retarded, the learning disabled, academically slow, school dropouts and those subject to the limitations which may accrue as a result of living in non-English speaking environments. Broad interest will continue with respect to cognitive development (language, thought processes, perception, attention, decision-making) as well as several aspects of social development (personality, emotional development, attitudes and behavior). High interest will be maintained in the problems of the poor, the inner city and the migratory populations of the U.S.

Increasingly high interest in FY '75 will be focused upon abused or neglected adolescents, the family structure, family functions, parenting skills, the general influences of the social/cultural environment, developing "developmental continuity" within the schools, analyzing program evaluation methods, the development of tests, measures and methods to improve comparability.

No change is to be expected with respect to methodological emphases: a high degree of attention will continue to be placed upon the use of intelligence and academic achievement tests with a low emphasis upon biological approaches.

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, DHEW

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $82.9 million[1]

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 805

Mission

The Office of Education's functions are to collect facts and statistics to show the condition and progress of education, to diffuse information to aid in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems and otherwise to promote the cause of education. Related functions delegated to OE include the responsibility for Federal financial assistance to education and for special studies and programs. This report will describe six subsections within OE which engage in research or development and demonstration activities affecting adolescents: The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, the Bureau of School Systems, the Office of Indian Education, the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, the Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation, and the Right-To-Read Effort. The activities of these sections are further analyzed by sections on the following pages.

Fiscal Year '74

Because the Office of Education sponsors more projects on research and development involving adolescence than any other single agency, it is not surprising that it enters into most of the descriptive categories displayed here. For example, even though it was more common for OE project proposals to mention the intention of utilizing survey research methodologies, 16 case studies, 10 clinical studies, and 73 projects utilizing observational techniques were also sponsored. There were 91 projects to encourage research support or utilization, 6 projects on planning, and 28 on evaluation. Ninety percent of the projects within the Office of Education were grants (less than 10% were made on a contractual basis);there were no intramural research or

---

[1] This figure does not reflect the 310 projects funded for $59.4 million by the Division of Bilingual Education in the Bureau of School Systems. At the time of writing, information was not available on these projects.

OE

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $82.9 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 805

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	12	$ 227,457	.8
Physical Development	0	0	0
Cognitive Development	4	136,103	.5
Socioemotional Development	1	27,986	.1
Family	0		0
Neighborhood	1	146,431	.1
Social Change	2	1,902,791	.2
Health/Welfare Services	12	1,307,365	1.5
Educational Institutions	779	78,514,605	96.8
Secondary School	150	9,959,972	18.6
Post-Secondary School	33	2,881,374	4.1
Vocational/Technical Schools	50	4,656,154	6.2
Law Enforcement	1	380,913	.1
The Research Process	4	438,486	.5

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

OE

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $82.9 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 805

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within the Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	78	$18,482,692	9.7
Grant	730	65,310,356	90.7
Intramural	0	0	0
TYPE OF R, D, & E[b]			
Basic Research	11	295,240	1.4
Applied Research and Demonstration	669	66,610,891	83.1
Evaluation	28	3,171,603	3.5
Research on Planning	6	1,010,567	.8
Research Support Activities	91	11,829,697	11.3
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	10	1,893,487	1.2
Case Study	16	1,170,038	2.0
Survey Techniques	97	10,671,154	12.1
Observational Techniques	73	11,624,143	9.1
Interview Techniques	60	12,624,284	7.5
Use of Questionnaires	134	18,069,749	16.7

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research, development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

development studies. Though the major portion of the adolescence activity centered around educational institutions, there were 6 projects focusing upon development, 12 on health or welfare institutions and four on the research process itself.

Plans For Fiscal Year '75

Plans for the next fiscal year within OE are broken down into each of the substantive subsections displayed: BSS, Right-To-Read, OIE, BEH, OPBE and BOAE.

OFFICE OF PLANNING, BUDGETING, AND EVALUATION
U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, DHEW

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $2.2 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 22

Mission

This office has primary responsibility for the planning, budgeting, and evaluation of overall Office of Education programs. It also guides and coordinates the various sections of OE in their planning, budgeting, evaluating, and establishing of objectives. Primary emphasis is placed on conducting evaluations of Office of Education Programs. OPBE prepares the analytical studies necessary for the planning of educational policy and specifies the kind of information which should be collected for the evaluation of Federal programs in elementary, secondary, postsecondary, vocational, and special education. OPBE also prepares program memoranda, special studies, and analyses supporting the OE five-year program and financial plan.

Fiscal Year '74

The Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation funded 22 project contracts directly affecting adolescents in FY '74. Sixty-eight percent of the agency's adolescence activity primarily focused upon evaluation of on-going projects, 18.2% on applied research, 9% on basic research (two projects) and 4.6% (one project) on planning research.[2]

Since much of OPBE's function is in the area of program evaluation, it is not surprising that 86% and 73% of its adolescence projects utilized questionnaire and survey techniques. Fifty-nine percent mentioned the use

---

[2] Applied research was defined as those efforts more directly applicable to immediate problems than basic research. It included pilot studies, test and material construction, and demonstration projects. It excluded programatic evaluation research, planning, and support. These latter two categories were defined as efforts to investigate the planning of goals, or the funding of conferences, publications, and other dissemination of information activities, respectively.

OE - OPBE

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $2.2 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 22

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	1	$ 63,368	4.6
Physical Development	0	0	0
Cognitive Development	0	0	0
Socioemotional Development	0	0	0
Family	0	0	0
Neighborhood	0	0	0
Social Change	0	0	0
Health/Welfare Services	0	0	0
Educational Institutions	20	1,949,064	90.9
Secondary School	2	46,709	9.1
Post-Secondary School	3	77,434	13.6
Vocational/Technical Schools	2	0	9.1
Law Enforcement	0	0	0
The Research Process	1	149,894	4.6

---

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

OE - OPBE

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $2.2 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 22

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	22	2,162,326	100.0
Grant	0	0	0
Intramural	0	0	0
TYPE OF R, D & E[b]			
Basic Research	2	0	9.1
Applied Research	4	320,568	18.2
Evaluation	15	1,841,758	68.2
Research on Planning	1	0	4.6
Research Support Activities	0	0	0
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	0	0	0
Case Study	0	0	0
Survey Techniques	16	1,685,831	72.7
Observational Techniques	3	1,075,659	13.6
Interview Techniques	13	2,086,304	59.1
Use of Questionnaires	19	1,896,622	86.4

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research, development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

of personal interviews and 13.6% the technique of observation. As the research chart demonstrates, 20 out of OPBE's 22 projects concentrated primarily upon educational institutions. Since only seven projects could be identified as primarily affecting secondary, vocational/technical or post-secondary schools, the balance (13 projects which primarily affect educational institutions) either affected adolescents in pre-secondary schools, or affected adolescents in more than one level or type of educational institution. In addition to these 20 projects, OPBE funded one study primarily focused upon adolescent development and one study upon the process of adolescence research.

Plans For Fiscal Year 75

In FY '75, increments in activity should be apparent in problems of bilingual education, language development, and migratory populations within the United States. The highest concern should continue to be directed toward the poor or "disadvantaged" Americans and lower levels toward the middle-class, the influence of the family, and the influence of the physical environment. High degrees of activity will continue to surround "open" classrooms, desegregation, and academic achievement measures. Among the research and evaluation techniques, the most frequently utilized should continue to be those of survey analysis, interviews and questionnaires, with an emphasis upon psychological issues.

BUREAU OF OCCUPATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION
U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, DHEW

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $14.3 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 159

Mission

Goals of the BOAE Center for Adult, Vocational, Technical, and Manpower Education include the improvement and expansion of vocational education guidance, counseling, placement, and follow-up systems, the improvement and expansion of cooperative education, and the integration of handicapped students into vocational education programs. The research areas related to this mission include curricula studies, e.g., the development of individualized and performance oriented curricula, the identification of emergency occupations and the resulting curriculum and manpower needs, and the identification of a common core of basic skills for occupational clusters. In addition, research areas include studies relating to the vocational education of disadvantaged, handicapped and minority populations, the study of alternative work experience programs, the development of guidance and student follow-up services, and the development of manpower information.

Fiscal Year '74

Most of BOAE's efforts in the age range of adolescence consists of applied research and development grants; both categories comprise 88% of the total projects. Like many other agencies, survey analytic techniques, questionnaires, and standardized interviews appear more frequently in project proposals than do the methodological techniques of clinical settings, case studies, or observation. Fully 29% of BOAE's research and development effort was focused primarily upon vocational/technical schools, 18% on secondary schools and 98% when all schools are combined.

OE - BOAE

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $14.3 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 159

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	1	$ 27,986	.6
Physical Development	0	0	0
Cognitive Development	0	0	0
Socioemotional Development	1	27,986	.6
Family	0	0	0
Neighborhood	0	0	0
Social Change	0	0	0
Health/Welfare Services	0	0	0
Educational Institutions	156	14,044,515	98.1
Secondary School	29	2,942,253	18.2
Post-Secondary School	11	1,161,127	6.9
Vocational/Technical Schools	46	4,261,945	28.9
Law Enforcement	0	0	0
The Research Process	2	183,105	1.3

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

OE - BOAE

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	18	3,609,889	11.3
Grant	141	10,645,717	88.7
Intramural	0	0	0
TYPE OF R, D & E[b]			
Basic Research	0	0	0
Applied Research	139	12,723,559	88.1
Evaluation	7	480,363	4.4
Research on Planning	2	102,717	1.3
Research Support Activities	11	948,967	6.9
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	0	0	0
Case Study	4	287,836	2.5
Survey Techniques	34	3,030,087	21.4
Observational Techniques	15	1,940,757	9.4
Interview Techniques	18	1,635,394	11.3
Use of Questionnaires	38	4,194,852	23.9

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research, development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

Plans For Fiscal Year '75

Medium levels of interest should continue in FY '75 concerning hearing, speech and sight problems, all aspects of intellectual handicaps, and the areas of decision-making, behavior, and integration efforts. A comparatively low profile of interest will be maintained in the areas of emotionally handicapping problems, adolescents who abuse drugs or who are abused and neglected, in adolescents who are parents, in voucher plans and in innovations in equipment. The higher levels of activity may gravitate toward experiments in "open" classrooms, work experience, in school vocational or technical education, on-the-job skill development, and comprehensive systems of guidance, counseling, placement, and student follow-up services. Among target groups, high interest should continue with respect to most minorities, Indians, and the poor; medium levels to white, middle class and migratory populations.

BUREAU OF EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED, U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, DHEW

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $20.3 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 116

Mission

The mission of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped is to insure that all handicapped children and youth receive appropriate educational services to enable them to develop their fullest potential and thereby reduce their degree of dependency. Research emphasis is placed on: (1) developing and demonstrating career education models relevant to the job market and the abilities and aspirations of the handicapped youth; (2) developing training methods for equipping personnel to meet the needs of handicapped youth; and (3) investigating means of enabling the most severely handicapped youth to become as independent as possible by providing increased opportunities for self-development.

Fiscal Year '74

Three projects within the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped are unique for our purposes. Because they had subcontracts (usually for reasons of dissemination) which were coded in more than one funding category and in more than one type of research, these few double codes influenced the percentages in this agency to add up to more than one hundred. However, of its 116 projects, 83 were funded for applied purposes, while 19 were principally used to disseminate information on adolescence by supporting meetings, conferences, publications, etc. Sixteen percent of the projects utilized observational techniques, the largest single methodological category. Almost by definition, the overwhelming portion of projects (88%) focused primarily upon schools of one kind or another in the hopes of offering better facilities to adolescents who are handicapped. In addition, however, there were eight projects focusing primarily upon health or welfare services and four upon adolescent cognitive development.

OE - BEH

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $20.3 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 116

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	4	$ 136,103	2.59
Physical Development	0	0	0
Cognitive Development	4	136,103	2.59
Social-Emotional Development	0	0	0
Family	0	0	0
Neighborhood	1	146,431	.86
Social Change	0	0	0
Health/Welfare Services	10	1,187,343	6.90
Educational Institutions	99	18,390,418	87.9
Secondary School	6	539,783	5.17
Post-Secondary School	3	484,366	2.59
Vocational/Technical Schools	0	0	0
Law Enforcement	1	380,913	.86
The Research Process	1	105,487	.86

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

OE - BEH

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $20.3 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 116

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	31	$ 7,672,324	26.4
Grant	88	13,549,371	75.9
Intramural	0	0	0
TYPE OF R, D & E[b]			
Basic Research	9	295,290	7.8
Applied Research	83	14,988,651	71.6
Evaluation	4	547,482	3.5
Research on Planning	1	34,012	.9
Research Support Activities	19	4,481,260	16.4
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	8	1,803,487	6.9
Case Study	4	536,609	3.5
Survey Techniques	14	3,396,537	12.1
Observational Techniques	19	4,947,780	16.4
Interview Techniques	6	3,234,180	5.2
Use of Questionnaires	15	2,265,191	13.0

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency. However, BEH had three projects which had both contract and grant sections, resulting in percentages in excess of one hundred.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research, development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

Plans For Fiscal Year '75

In FY '75, BEH should maintain their present levels of interest throughout the various aspects of handicaps: physical, emotional, and intellectual--including the retarded and learning disabled. Comparatively strong interest might be shown with respect to autistic and schizophrenic youth, but no change is expected among the areas of cognitive, socioemotional, or physical development. Especially high interest could be expressed over any new innovations in equipment, career education, on-the-job skill development, and in school vocational or technical education. In addition, high attention should focus upon new research designs, performance on standardized measures of academic achievement and intelligence tests, and the use of techniques of observation. In FY '75, less interest may be expressed in the methodologies of longitudinal research.

OFFICE OF INDIAN EDUCATION
U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, DHEW

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $11.4 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 117

Mission

The goal of the Office of Indian Education, authorized by the Indian Education Act of 1972, is to improve the quality of public education for Indian pupils. The Office of Indian Education administers programs of grants to local and non-local educational agencies for elementary and secondary school programs designed to meet the special educational needs of Indian children. In addition, this office also administers grants or, where applicable, contracts with eligible institutions, organizations, agencies or Indian tribes for special programs and projects designed to improve educational opportunities for Indian children and adults. Other efforts to improve educational opportunities for Indians at all educational levels are also coordinated by this office.

Fiscal Year '74

The Office of Indian Education funded 117 grants on adolescence, virtually all of which were applied to questions and problems within schools. In addition, there was one evaluation study of $232,000 and one project to support information utilization activities.

Plans For Fiscal Year '75

No significant shifts in interest should occur within the Office of Indian Education in FY '75. A low level can be expected concerning problems such as the physically and emotionally handicapped, the retarded and those hindered by learning disabilities, or physical diseases of one kind or another.

OE - OIE

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $11.4 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 117

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	0	$ 0	0
Physical Development	0	0	0
Cognitive Development	0	0	0
Socioemotional Development	0	0	0
Family	0	0	0
Neighborhood	0	0	0
Social Change	1	130,000	.9
Health/Welfare Services	0	0	0
Educational Institutions	116	11,263,495	99.2
Secondary School	9	453,991	7.7
Post-Secondary School	5	606,000	4.3
Vocational/Technical Schools	0	0	0
Law Enforcement	0	0	0
The Research Process	0	0	0

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

OE - OIE

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $11.4 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 117

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescent Projects Within The Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	0	$ 0	0
Grant	117	11,393,495	100.0
Intramural	0	0	0
TYPE OF R, D, & E[b]			
Basic Research	0	0	0
Applied Research	115	11,063,495	98.3
Evaluation	1	232,000	.9
Research on Planning	0	0	0
Research Support Activities	1	98,000	.9
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	0	0	0
Case Study	2	110,000	1.7
Survey Techniques	12	1,320,259	10.3
Observational Techniques	4	510,209	3.4
Interview Techniques	9	1,063,451	7.7
Use of Questionnaires			

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research, development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

Low levels also might be expected to continue with respect to equipment innovations, work experience, voluntary service and psychotherapy or psychological counseling.

However, medium interest levels can be expected with respect to the use of drugs, adolescents who are abused or neglected, the cognitive influences of perception and decision making, all areas of socioemotional development and the influences of the family and the mass media. The highest attention within OIE should continue to focus upon those adolescents who are judged as academically slow, those who drop out of school or who are poor. The highest interest should continue on the subjects of language development, the problems stemming from not speaking English, remedial reading, hyperkinesia, thought processes and both physical and sociocultural environmental influences. As consistent with the OIE's mandate, the strongest focus will continue to be targeted toward native Americans whether living on reservations, in non-reservation rural areas, or in cities.

RIGHT-TO-READ EFFORT
U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, DHEW

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $5.3 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 131

Mission

The National Right-To-Read Effort is designed to demonstrate effective procedures for eliminating present functional illiteracy and for preventing its future occurrence. The goal of this effort is to create models which could provide corrective remediation for all those who are presently experiencing the results of being functionally illiterate.

Fiscal Year '74

Virtually all of the Right to Read Effort's 131 applied research and development grants on adolescence were concentrated within educational institutions, primarily within secondary schools. Observational techniques were more frequently mentioned in the proposals than any other methodological category.

Plans For Fiscal Year '75

The Right-To-Read Effort should be expected to maintain its high interest in funding projects surrounding the problems of school dropouts, non-English speakers, the cognitive areas of language development, attention and perception, and the areas of socioemotional attitudes and remedial reading. In addition, the Effort should maintain a medium level of interest in parenting skills, speech and aural handicap problems, and the intellectual difficulties of the retarded, the learning disabled, and those who, for many reasons, have been categorized as being academically slow. Lastly, there are several foci which should receive increases in activity placing

RIGHT-TO-READ

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $5.3 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 131

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	0	$ 0	0
Physical Development	0	0	0
Cognitive Development	0	0	0
Social-Emotional Development	0	0	0
Family	0	0	0
Neighborhood	0	0	0
Social Change	0	0	0
Health/Welfare Services	0	0	0
Educational Institutions	131	5,280,547	100.0
Secondary School	39	1,721,089	29.8
Post-Secondary School	8	319,916	6.1
Vocational/Technical Schools	0	0	0
Law Enforcement	0	0	0
The Research Process	0	0	0

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

RIGHT-TO-READ

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

- Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $5.3 million
- Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 131

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	0	$ 0	0
Grant	131	5,280,547	100.0
Intramural	0	0	0
TYPE OF R, D & E[b]			
Basic Research	0	0	0
Applied Research	131	5,280,547	100.0
Evaluation	0	0	0
Research on Planning	0	0	0
Research Support Activities	0	0	0
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	2	90,000	1.5
Case Study	0	0	0
Survey Techniques	1	90,000	.8
Observational Techniques	10	554,451	7.6
Interview Techniques	1	37,550	.8
Use of Questionnaires	6	248,290	4.6

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research, development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

them among those areas already with high levels. They are the following: skills developed through on-the-job training, and the development of tests, measures and the methodologies of program evaluation.

BUREAU OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS
U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, DHEW

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $29.5 million[3]

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 260

Mission:

The Bureau of School Systems formulates policy for, directs, and coordinates the activities and elements of the Office of Education which deal with preschool, elementary and secondary education. Four divisions within the Bureau conduct development or demonstration activities pertinent to adolescence: (1) the Division of Equal Education Opportunity Program Operations funds special projects that are centrally administered Emergency School Aid (ESA) programs which include demonstration desegregation assistance projects and educational television projects; (2) the Division of Supplementary Centers and Services administers two kinds of innovative demonstration projects: those which provide solutions to state and local educational problems under the State Plan Program and those which provide solutions to problems common to all or several states under the Special Program and Project Authority; (3) the Division of Technology and Environmental Education supports the development, demonstration, and dissemination of multidisciplinary, problem-oriented environmental education programs and the effective employment of technology for improvement of education instruction and delivery of programs and services; and (4) the Division of Bilingual Education supports the development and demonstration of educational programs, curriculum materials and teacher training programs designed to meet the needs of youth who come from environments where the dominant language is not English and who have limited English-speaking ability.

---

[3] This figure does not reflect the 310 projects funded for $59.4 million by the Division of Bilingual Education. At the time of writing, information was not available on these projects.

BSS

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $29.5 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 260

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	0	$ 0	0
Physical Development	0	0	0
Cognitive Development	0	0	0
Social-Emotional Development	0	0	0
Family	0	0	0
Neighborhood	0	0	0
Social Change	1	1,772,791	.4
Health/Welfare Services	2	120,022	.8
Educational Institutions	257	27,586,566	98.8
Secondary School	65	4,253,147	25.0
Post-Secondary School	3	232,531	1.1
Vocational/Technical Schools	2	394,209	.8
Law Enforcement	0	0	0
The Research Process	0	0	0

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon on (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

BSS

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $29.5 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 260

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within the Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	7	$ 5,038,153	2.7
Grant	253	24,441,226	97.3
Intramural	0	0	
TYPE OF R, D, & E[b]			
Basic Research	0	0	0
Applied Research and Demonstration	197	22,214,071	75.8
Evaluation	1	70,000	.4
Research on Planning	2	873,838	.8
Research Support Activities	60	6,321,470	23.1
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	0	0	0
Case Study	4	235,593	1.5
Survey Techniques	9	1,148,440	3.5
Observational Techniques	22	2,595,287	8.5
Interview Techniques	13	4,567,405	5.0
Use of Questionnaires	41	7,952,847	15.8

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research, development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

Fiscal Year '74

Not surprisingly, of the 7 contracts and 270 project grants involving adolescence (exclusing those within the Division of Bilingual Education), 93% were primarily focused upon secondary schools with a very small portion (.7%) concentrated upon vocational or technical schools. In addition, however, effort was evident in socioemotional development (6 projects) and in the area of health and welfare services (12 projects). The most frequently utilized methodology was the use of questionnaires; 18% of the BSS projects intended to utilize them.

Plans for Fiscal Year '75

The Bureau of School Systems, because of its constituent sections of Equal Educational Opportunity and Bilingual Education, can be expected to maintain its present high levels of interest in bilingual handicaps, the language, thought and perceptual processes of cognitive development, in remedial reading, desegregation problems, and academic achievement. Its activities should continue to affect most sectors of the disadvantaged adolescent populations: Spanish-speakers, immigrants, urban and ghetto dwellers, blacks and whites. However, increased attention might be expected to occur with respect to migratory populations.

Lower attention levels can be expected to be maintained in the areas of handicapping problems and social, emotional, and physical development problems. The influences of the family, guidance counseling, "open" classrooms and voucher proposals will be maintained as low level interests, along with the use of intelligence tests, self-concept measures, observational and longitudinal techniques, and specific social science disciplines.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $.4 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 43

Mission

The purpose of the Department of Agriculture is to acquire and diffuse useful information on agricultural subjects in the broadest sense. The Department's functions encompass research, education, conservation, marketing, regulatory work, agricultural adjustment, surplus disposal, and rural development. Certain of its many research goals focus on "people oriented programs." There are studies of the family which emphasize the interrelationships between human beings, their near environment, and their interactions which are particularly relevant to adolescence. Current social concerns such as malnutrition, mobility (both geographical and social), interpersonal understanding, adolescent roles, occupational and educational goals, personal stability, social adjustment, learning processes, intergenerational values and school achievement are all within the purview of the USDA research.

Fiscal Year '74

In the 43 research grants made by the Department of Agriculture involving adolescence in FY '74, there appears to be a substantial reliance upon the techniques of survey analysis. Fifty-eight percent of the projects specifically mentioned that the principal investigator had intended to use survey analytic techniques.[4] In addition there was a very wide distribution of project foci. Thirty-two percent of the agency's projects on adolescence focused primarily upon socioemotional development, 23% upon physical development, 14% on the family, 9% on secondary schools, and 7% on charting the influences of social change.

---

[4] Since many projects may utilize survey techniques but did not specify them in their proposal, the eventual figure may be quite a bit higher.

USDA

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R,D, D, & E: $.4 million

0 Number of Adolescence Projects: 43

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	26	$206,797	60.5
Physical Development	10	136,019	23.3
Cognitive Development	2	25,133	4.7
Socioemotional Development		45,645	32.6
Family	6	66,985	14.0
Neighborhood	0	0	0
Social Change	3	94,480	7.0
Health/Welfare Services	0	0	0
Educational Institutions	7	34,971	16.2
Secondary School	4	20,774	9.3
Post-Secondary School	1	0	2.3
Vocational/Technical Schools	1	0	2.3
Law Enforcement	0	0	0
The Research Process	1	3,373	2.3

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivaluent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

USDA

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $.4 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 43

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	0	$ 0	0
Grant	43	406,606	100.0
Intramural	0	0	0
TYPE OF R, D & E[b]			
Basic Research	13	90,457	30.2
Applied Research	27	295,375	62.8
Evaluation	3	20,774	7.0
Research on Planning	0	0	0
Research Support Activities	0	0	0
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	0	0	0
Case Study	4	32,312	9.3
Survey Techniques	25	215,349	58.1
Observational Techniques	0	0	0
Interview Techniques	8	76,452	18.6
Use of Questionnaires	11	65,948	25.6

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proporation of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research, development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

Plans For Fiscal Year '75

The USDA will continue its interest in the poor, the minorities, and the rural populations of the nation. High attention will continue over questions of attitudes, and of occupational aspiration and expectations; less interest will be paid to other aspects of personality development, cognitive or physical development. A medium or high level of interest will again surround questions of family functions, the influences of the social/cultural environment, work experience, in-school vocational/technical education, and on-the-job skill development. Interest will also focus upon longitudinal research designs and program evaluation methods with a heavy emphasis on sociology and a low emphasis on history or political science.

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

- 0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $1.2 million
- 0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 32

Mission

The Department of Labor is charged with administering and enforcing statutes aimed at promoting the welfare of wage earners, improving their working conditions and advancing their opportunities for profitable employment. The major objectives of the Manpower Administration, whose research is reported here, are to provide job training and employment opportunities for economically disadvantaged, unemployed, and underemployed persons, and to assure that training and other services lead to maximum employment opportunities and enhance self-sufficiency by establishing a flexible and decentralized system of Federal, State, and local programs. The Manpower Administration research program places special emphasis on aiding those persons with special problems--for example, the handicapped and veterans. The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act lists two possible areas for research which are particularly relevant to adolescence: improving means of measuring future labor demand and easing the transition from school to work.

Fiscal Year '74

One half (16 projects) of the Department of Labor's research and development activities affecting adolescence in FY '74 were directed toward the improvement of vocational or technical schools. An additional 15.6% (5 projects) were directed toward secondary schools more generally, while projects on adolescence primarily directed toward educational institutions made up fully 75% of all adolescence research and evaluation activity. Perhaps because of the heavy influence of economics and sociology upon the collection of labor statistics more generally, 40.6% of its research and evaluation projects involved the techniques of survey analysis; 16% intended in their proposals to utilize questionnaires; and an excess of one-third included the techniques of interviewing.

DOL

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $1.2 million
0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 32

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	4	$ 189,095	12.5
Physical Development	0	0	0
Cognitive Development	0	0	0
Socioemotional Development	4	189,095	12.5
Family	2	5,000	6.3
Neighborhood	0	0	0
Social Change	1	12,230	3.1
Health/Welfare Services	1	0	3.1
Educational Institutions	24	1,032,377	75.0
Secondary School	5	202,894	15.6
Post-Secondary School	2	23,605	6.3
Vocational/Technical Schools	16	804,878	50.0
Law Enforcement	0	0	0
The Research Process	0	0	0

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

DOL

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $1.2 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 32

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	9	$537,896	28.1
Grant	23	700,806	71.9
Intramural	0	0	0
TYPE OF R, D & E[b]			
Basic Research	5	57,235	15.6
Applied Research	11	598,348	34.4
Evaluation	8	230,319	25.0
Research on Planning	8	352,800	25.0
Research Support Activities	0	0	0
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	0	0	0
Case Study	1	0	3.1
Survey Techniques	13	365,545	40.6
Observational Techniques	4	53,264	12.5
Interview Techniques	11	290,768	34.4
Use of Questionnaires	16	210,036	16.4

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research, development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

Plans For Fiscal Year '75

Research emanating from the Department of Labor will always reflect the problems of adolescents which affect or are affected by the macroeconomic. Consequently, low activity will continue on questions of physical handicaps, the autistic, the schizophrenic, the retarded, the learning disabled and problems involving cognitive, socioemotional development and family interaction. A modicum of research will deal with delinquency, school drop-outs and questions of bilinguality. Although low volume will continue over questions of drug users, high attention will continue to focus upon the poor, the migrant and those who live in inner city ghettos. High attention will also surround the new suggestions of voucher plans, desegregation efforts, work experience, vocational/technical education and on-the-job skill development. Methodological emphasis will continue to focus upon survey analysis and longitudinal techniques as opposed to interview or observational studies.

ACTION

0 FY '74 Funding of Adolescence Research: $8.3 million

0 Number of Adolescent Research Projects Sponsored in FY '74: 5

Mission

The mission of ACTION with respect to adolescence is to operate what are referred to as service learning programs as set forth in the "Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973." Among them can be included the Youth Challenge Program and the Program for Local Service which are experimental programs designed to develop and test different ways to enable youth volunteers to meet community needs in a manner which will have recognized educational value. Similarly, the University Year for ACTION is a program in which academic credit can be given for youth volunteer community service performed under the supervision of a participating university.

Fiscal Year '74

Five applied research and evaluation grants were funded by ACTION in FY '74. One project primarily focused upon adolescent development, two upon health and welfare services, and two upon various educational institutions.

Plans For Fiscal Year '75

ACTION programs will continue to lay their highest emphasis upon the innovative educational experience derived from voluntary service by students. High degrees of emphasis will also be laid upon the specific programs of voucher plans for community service and service experience in the direction of career education. ACTION development programs should affect a broad range of target groups, but will try to be directed especially to the poor or "disadvantaged," and to the populations who either live on Indian Reservations, or are migratory.

ACTION

PRIMARY RESEARCH FOCI[a]

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D, & E: $8.3 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 5

Primary Focus	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency
Developmental	1	$ 176,000	20.0
Physical Development	0	0	0
Cognitive Development	0	0	0
Socioemotional Development	0	0	0
Family	0	0	0
Neighborhood	0	0	0
Social Change	0	0	0
Health/Welfare Services	2	1,398,698	40.0
Educational Institutions	2	6,720,000	40.0
Secondary School	0	0	0
Post-Secondary School	1	6,600,000	20.0
Vocational/Technical Schools	0	0	0
Law Enforcement	0	0	0
The Research Process	0	0	0

[a] Each proposal was described as focusing primarily upon one (and only one) of the major categories. When an educational or developmental project could also be placed within a subcategory, it was duly noted; thus the sum of the subcategories in these two areas may not be the equivalent of the larger focus. However, the sum of these larger categories should approximate one hundred percent of all the activity on adolescence within each agency.

ACTION

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS: FY '74

0 Funding of Adolescence R, D, D & E: $8.3 million

0 Number of Adolescence Research Projects: 5

	# of Projects	Amount of Funds	% of Adolescence Projects Within The Agency[a]
FUNDING CATEGORY[b]			
Contract	0	$ 0	0
Grant	5	8,294,698	100.0
Intramural	0	0	0
TYPE OF R, D & E[b]			
Basic Research	0	0	0
Applied Research	5	8,294,698	100.0
Evaluation	0	0	0
Research on Planning	0	0	0
Research Support Activities	0	0	0
METHODOLOGIES[c]			
Clinical	0	0	0
Case Study	0	0	0
Survey Techniques	0	0	0
Observational Techniques	0	0	0
Interview Techniqes	0	0	0
Use of Questionnaires	0	0	0

[a] Each agency has a varying number of projects which affect adolescence. This figure is the proportion of these projects within this particular agency.

[b] Each project was placed in one funding category and in one research, development and evaluation category. Thus, within these two, each subcategory is mutually exclusive of each other subcategory; the sum of the percentages therefore approximates one hundred.

[c] The descriptive characteristics are not mutually exclusive. A project proposal may have mentioned the intention to use one, more than one, or none of these methodological categories; the proportion figures should not approximate one hundred.

APPENDIX A

AGENCY PLANS FOR ADOLESCENCE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN FY '75

AGENCY PLANS FOR ADOLESCENCE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN FY '75

Specific Interests by General Area	Level of Agency Interest FY '75[a]		
	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
TARGET POPULATION CHACTERISTICS			
Physically Handicapped		BOAE, BEH	BSS, DOL, NIE, OIE
Aurally Handicapped		NINDS, Right-To Read	NICHD
Visually Handicapped			NICHD
Neurologically	NICHD		NINDS
Orthopedically			NICHD
Speech		NICHD, Right-To-Read, BCHS	
Emotionally Handicapped			BSS,BOAE,OIE
Schizophrenic		BEH	NIDA
Autistic		BEH	NICHD
Delinquent	NIMH	NIDA, OCD, DOL	OYD (-)
Run-aways	OYD (+)	SRS	NIDA, NICHD, DOL
Emotional Aspects of Drug Abuse	NIDA		
Intellectually Handicapped	NIE	BOAE	BSS
Retarded	NICHD	BEH, Right-To-Read, OCD	DOL, NIMH, NIE, OIE
Learning Disabled		BEH, OCD, Right-To-Read, NIE, NICHD	DOL, OIE

---

[a] Pluses and minuses in parentheses indicate that the level of the agency's FY '75 interest in this area has increased or decreased significantly from FY '74.

Agency Plans For Adolescence Research And Development (Continued)

Specific Interests by General Area	Level of Agency Interest FY '75[a]		
	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
TARGET POPULATION CHACTERISTICS			
Intellectually Handicapped (Continued)			
Academically Slow	OIE	NIE, NICHD, Right-To-Read, OCD	DOL, OYD
School Drop-outs	BSS, Right-To-Read, OIE, NIE (+)	OCD, NICHD, DOL	OYD, USDA
Bilingual	NIE, BSS (+), Right-To-Read, OIE, OPBE (+)	OCD, DOL	OYD, NICHD, USDA
Drug Users	BSS	OIE	OYD, BOAE, DOL
Heroin	NIDA		
Marijuana	NIDA		
Alcohol			NIDA, USDA
Multiple Drug Use	NIDA		
Related to Pregnancy Outcomes		BCHS	
Abused or Neglected Adolescents	OCD (+), NIDA	NICHD (+), SRS, OIE	OYD, USDA, BEH

Agency Plans For Adolescence Research And Development (Continued)

Specific Interests by General Area	Level of Agency Interest FY '75[a]		
	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
TARGET POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS			
Adolescent Parents	NIDA	OCD, NICHD	OYD, USDA, BOAE
Demographic Characteristics			
Black Population	BSS, NIE, DOL, USDA	OCD	
White Population	BSS, DOL, USDA	OCD, BOAE, NIE	
Puerto-Rican	BSS, NIE, DOL, USDA	OCD	
Mexican-American	BSS, NIE, DOL, USDA	OCD	
Oriental-American		BSS, NIE, DOL, OCD, USDA	
Native-American	USDA, OIE	NIE, DOL, OCD	
Poor or "Disadvantaged"	BSS, OPBE, NIE, OCD, DOL, USDA, ACTION		
Middle-Class		NIE, OCD, OIE	BSS, DOL, USDA
Immigrant-Americans	BSS	NIE, OCD	DOL, USDA
Urban	DOL	BSS, OCD, NIE	USDA
Suburban		OCD, DOL	BSS, USDA, NIE
Ghetto	BSS, OCD, DOL	NIE	OIE

Agency Plans For Adolescence Research And Development (Continued)

Specific Interests by General Area	Level of Agency Interest FY '75[a]		
	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
TARGET POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS			
Demographic Characteristics (Continued)			
Indian Reservation	DOL, ACTION, OIE	OCD, NIE, USDA	
Migratory Population	OCD, BSS (+), ACTION, DOL, OPBE (+)	NIE	USDA, OIE
Population Outside the U.S.		OCD	DOL, OYD, NIE, NICHD, USDA
Rural-Non-Reservation		OIE	
SUBJECT FOCUS OF THE RESEARCH			
Cognitive Development	BSS	BEH, NIDA	OPBE, USDA
Language Development	OPBE, OIE NIE, NICHD, Right-To-Read	OCD	NINDS
Thought Processes	NIE, NICHD, OIE	OCD	
Perception/Attention	Right-To-Read	OCD, NICHD, OIE	NIE
Decision-making		OCD, NIMH, NICHD, BOAE, OIE	OYD, NIE, DOL
Socioemotional Development		NIDA (+), BEH	OYD, OPBE, BSS, NIE
Personality Development	NICHD	OCD, USDA, OIE	DOL
Emotional Development	NICHD	OCD, OIE	DOL, USDA
Attitudes	USDA, Right-To-Read	OPBE, NICHD OCD, OIE	BOAE, DOL

Agency Plans For Adolescence Research And Development (Continued)

Specific Interests by General Area	Level of Agency Interest FY '75[a]		
	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
SUBJECT FOCUS OF THE RESEARCH			
Socioemotional Development (Continued)			
Behavior	NIMH, NICHD	BOAE, OCD, OIE	DOL, USDA
Physical Development		NIDA, BEH	BSS
Body Growth	NICHD		USDA, OIE
Physical Disease		NICHD, NINDS	USDA, OIE
Veneral Disease		NINDS	OYD
Neurological Disease		NINDS	
Nutrition, Knowledge and Attitudes		BCHS	
The Family Influences On The Adolescent		NIDA, OIE	OYD, DOL, BSS OPBE
Family Structure	OCD (+), NICHD		NIE, USDA
Family Functions	OCD (+), NICHD	NIMH, USDA	NIE
Parenting Skills	OCD (+)	NIE, Right-To-Read	NICHD, USDA
The Neighborhood/Local Environmental Influences On The Adolescent		NIDA	OPBE
Physical Environment	OIE	OCD	NIE, NICHD (-), DOL, USDA
Social/Cultural Environment	NIMH, OCD (+), NICHD, OIE	USDA	NIE, DOL

Agency Plans For Adolescence Research And Development (Continued)

Specific Interests by General Area	Level of Agency Interest FY '75		
	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
SUBJECT FOCUS OF THE RESEARCH			
The Neighborhood/Local Environment Influences On The Adolescent (Continued)			
Institutional Barriers To Youth Development	OYD		
Availability & Utilization Of Health Services		BCHS	
Influences Of Mass Media/TV On The Adolescent		NICHD, OIE	NIDA, NIE, OCD, USDA
Special Education			
Remedial Reading	BSS, Right-To-Read, OIE	NIE, DOL	OYD, NICHD
Hyperkinesia	OIE	BEH	NIE, NICHD
Innovative Education (Within Schools)		NIE	OYD
Voucher Plans	DOL	NIE	BSS, OPBE, BOAE
"Open" Classrooms	OPBE, BOAE	NIE, OIE	BSS
Desegregation	BSS, OPBE, BEH, DOL	BOAE, NIE	
Equipment Innovations	BEH	OPBE, NIE	BOAE, OIE, DOL (-)
Special School Programs For Delinquency		NIMH	
Drug Education	NIDA		

Agency Plans For Adolescence Research And Development (Continued)

Specific Interest by General Area	Level of Agency Interest FY '75[a]		
	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
SUBJECT FOCUS OF THE RESEARCH			
Innovative Education (Within Schools) (Continued)			
"Prescriptive" Teaching		OIE	
Developmental Continuity		OCD (+)	
Service Learning Plans	ACTION		
Alternatives To Schools	NIE	NIDA	OYD
Work Experience (Job Skills Secondary)	DOL, BOAE NIE	BEH, OCD, USDA	OIE
Voluntary Service By Students	ACTION	BOAE, OCD DOL	NIE, USDA, OIE
Age-Balanced Institutions			NIE, OCD
Schools "Without Walls"		BOAE, NIE, OCD	
Career Education	NIE, ACTION NIDA		OYD
In School Vocational/ Technical Education	BEH, BOAE, NIE, DOL, USDA	OIE	
On The Job Skill Development	BEH, BOAE, DOL, NIE, Right-To-Read (+)	USDA , OIE	
Psychotherapy And Psychological Counseling	NIDA		NIE, USDA, NICHD , OIE
Guidance	BOAE		BSS
Counseling Of Youth And Families Of Runaways	OYD (+)		

Agency Plans For Adolescence Research And Development (Continued)

Specific Interest by General Area	Level of Agency Interest FY '75[a]		
	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
SUBJECT FOCUS OF THE RESEARCH			
Birth Control/Abortion	NICHD		OIE
Contraception			OYD
Research On Research Methodology			
Development of Tests And Measures	OYD (+), NIMH, Right-To-Read (+), NIDA (+)	NIE, USDA, DOL	BEH, NICHD
Program Evaluation Methods	OYD (+), NIDA (+), NIMH, Right-To-Read (+) DOL, OCD (+)	BEH, USDA, NIE, SRS (+)	NICHD
Observational Methods	NIMH, DOL	BEH, NIE, OCD	NICHD, USDA
Research Designs	NIMH, DOL, BEH	OCD, SRS (+), USDA	NIE, NICHD
Survey Analysis Methods	OYD (+), DOL, NIDA (+)	OCD, BEH, NIE	NIMH, USDA, NICHD
Statistical Techniques	OYD (+), DOL, NIMH	OCD, BEH, SRS (+), NIE	NICHD, USDA
Methodologies Of Longitudinal Research	DOL, USDA	OCD, NIMH, NICHD	BEH (-), NIE
Methods To Improve Comparability	OYD (+), OCD (+), NIDA (+), DOL	USDA, NIMH, SRS (+), BEH	NIE, NICHD
Global Approaches	DOL	OCD	NIE, NICHD, USDA
Interview Techniques		OCD, NIMH, DOL, BEH	NIE, USDA, NICHD

Agency Plans For Adolescence Research And Development (Continued)

Specific Interest by General Area	Level of Agency Interest FY '75[a]		
	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
SUBJECT FOCUS OF THE RESEARCH			
Research On Research Methodology (Continued)			
Questionnaire Methods		OCD, NIMH, BEH, DOL	NIE, USDA, NICHD
APPROACHES AND TECHNIQUES TO BE UTILIZED			
Intelligence Tests	NIE, BEH, OCD	NICHD	BSS, NIMH, OPBE, BOAE, DOL
Academic Achievement	NIE, BSS, OCD, OPBE, BEH	NICHD	BOAE, OYD (+), NIMH, DOL, USDA
Self Concept/Locus Of Control Measures		NIE, NIDA (+), OCD, OPBE	BOAE, OYD (+), BEH, USDA, DOL, BSS, NIMH, NICHD
Observation Techniques	NIMH	BOAE, OPBE, NICHD, BEH, NIE, OCD, NINDS	DOL, BSS, USDA
Interview Techniques	NIMH, OPBE, NIDA	BOAE, OCD, NIE	DOL, BEH, NICHD, USDA
Survey Analysis	OYD (+), NIDA (+), DOL, NIMH, OPBE	BOAE, OCD, NIE, NICHD, USDA	BEH
Questionnaires	NIMH, OPBE	BOAE, OCD, BEH, DOL, USDA	NIE, NICHD

Agency Plans For Adolescence Research And Development (Continued)

Specific Interest by General Area	Level of Agency Interest FY '75[a]		
	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
APPROACHES AND TECHNIQUES TO BE UTILIZED			
Longitudinal Techniques	NIDA, DOL, OPBE, USDA	BOAE, OCD, NIE, NICHD	BSS, NIMH, BEH
Historical Emphasis	NIDA (+)	NIE, OCD	BOAE, BSS, NICHD BEH, OPBE, USDA
Sociological Emphasis	NIMH, USDA, NIDA (+), NICHD	NIE, OPBE, OCD, DOL	BOAE, BSS, BEH
Psychological Emphasis	NIMH, OPBE, NICHD, NIDA (+), NIE	OCD, USDA, DOL	BOAE, BSS, BEH
Political Emphasis		NIE, OCD	BSS, OPBE, BEH, USDA, NIMH, BOAE, NICHD
Bilogical Emphasis	NIDA, NINDS, NICHD		BSS, BOAE, NIE, NIMH, BEH, OCD
Anthropological Emphasis		OCD, NICHD	BSS, OPBE, BEH, USDA, NIMH, BOAE, NIE
Secondary Analysis of Data	OYD (+)		
Operations Systems Analysis		SRS (+)	

[a] Pluses and minuses in parentheses indicate that the level of the agency's FY '75 interest in this area has increased or decreased significantly from FY '74.

APPENDIX B

GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES
FOR USE OF INTERAGENCY PANEL INFORMATION SYSTEM

GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR USE OF INTERAGENCY PANEL INFORMATION SYSTEM

The Interagency Panel on Early Childhood Research and Development in 1971 established a computerized data system in order to facilitate the sharing of information and to encourage the coordination of planning among the member agencies. Prior to the establishment of this data system, no organization collected and disseminated information about ongoing research from all of the Panel member agencies. The data bank, now in its fourth year of existence, incorporates a unique and ever expanding data file about early childhood research grants and contracts funded by member agencies.

Since 1971, the Social Research Group staff has annually developed a more comprehensive book of descriptors with corresponding codes. This book is used to classify each project according to a given set of qualifying characteristics. In the early years of the Panel, agency representatives classified their own agency projects and that information became the basis of the computerized data bank. Today, however, the collection, coding and computerizing effort has grown considerably. The Panel staff now collects and codes the projects from a growing number of member agencies. The computerized data system contains over 3,000 projects on early childhood and adolescence classified by 525 descriptors as compared with a 1971 data bank of 750 projects classified by 150 descriptors. This expanded collection and classification effort allows for more detailed research analyses.

Data System Operation

Projects are characterized by a set of four digit codes which correspond to a set of descriptors. The coding system is broad enough in scope to include detailed information about a project's funding and duration, sample characteristics, purpose, methodology and data collection techniques, and areas of research focus.

Each project within the data system is assigned a five digit computer identification number. The first two digits represent the agency code number and the last three digits identify the particular project in the agency. The data base for early childhood research is drawn from the following agencies:

01	Bureau of Community Health Services (BCHS)
02	National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH)
03	National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD)
05	Office of Child Development (OCD)
07	Social and Rehabilitation Service (SRS)
08	OE--Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH)
09	OE--Bureau of School Systems (BSS)
15	National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke (NINDS)
16	OE--Title III
17	OE--Right-To-Read Effort
21	National Institute of Mental Health--Intramural Research
22	National Institute of Child Health and Human Development--Intramural
24	United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)
25	OE--Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (BOAE)
26	OE--Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation (OPBE)
29	Department of Labor (DOL)
30	National Institute of Education (NIE)
33	OE--Office of Environmental Education (OEE)
34	OE--Office of Equal Education Opportunity (OEEO)
35	National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA)
36	OE--Office of Indian Education (OIE)
37	National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA)

After the projects have been coded, the numeric codes are keypunched, verified, and programmed onto a computer tape and a disk data set.

Essentially, the data system is composed of four data files: (1) Literal file. This file contains the name of the funding agency, the project identification number and project title. (2) Numeric file. This file contains coded descriptor sets which characterize the project under study. Each project within the system is defined by a separate set of characteristics, all of which are drawn from the classification scheme. (3) Funding file. This file contains the FY '74 funding. If no funds were expended in FY '74 or if project funding was not available, the project is marked as having received "0" funds. Since continued projects maintain the same identification number from year to year, it is possible to obtain the previous year's funding on a given project. (4) Instrumentation file. This file contains a coded list of standardized instruments which were utilized in each study. Homemade and other uncommon tests and measures are coded under a general set of descriptors, such as physical test, questionnaire, interview and other items.

These four files, although entered as separate data sets, are eventually merged into one data system master file. In addition, the principal investigators of the projects in the data system are listed alphabetically, along with the identification numbers of their projects.

Requests may be made for information retrieval from all of the above mentioned files. Also, a brief abstract is available for each research project contained in the data system. This abstract usually contains the purpose, objectives, methodology, and when available, the sample characteristics and the instrumentation used in the study. Given the assumption that the information available is intended to function as a guide to direct the requestor toward the principal investigator and/or the sponsoring agency for further information, the abstracts are kept as short and concise as possible.

How to Make a Request

A request for information about the data system projects may be made in writing or by telephone (followed by a written request) to:

Social Research Group, G.W.U.
Attn: Ronald H. Ouellet
2401 Virginia Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20037

Telephone: (202) 331-8706

In general, the more specific the request the better the response to that request. Information requests can be more accurately answered if code numbers are included in the request.

Descriptors and corresponding code numbers are contained in the Social Research Group classification scheme (Harrell, 1974). A typical example of a request might be:

> Send titles, funding and abstracts of all agencies' projects dealing with cognitive development (5049) in urban (2050) black (2033) children ages 3 to 5 (2006, 2007, 2008), in a day care setting (5293).

The computer program for information retrieval is flexible enough to meet a wide variety of needs of the requestor. Program capabilities allow for the printing of these types of information: (1) identification number; (2) project title; (3) funding; and (4) number of qualifying projects, and amount of funding within and across agencies. Additional statistical information is available on request.

Policy for Information Release

The policy of both Panels is that whatever information is in the data bank should be made available to whoever makes a request. In recent years an increased number of requests for information has come from interested agencies and from persons outside the Federal government, and there has been a much greater dissemination of information from the data system this year than in any previous year. Numerous requests have been answered for Panel member agencies, other Federal agencies, Congressional committees, universities, foundations, institutes, and individual researchers.

In order to keep the Panel members informed of all requests that are received, the Social Research Group keeps a log of the following information: (1) name of requestor; (2) nature of request; and (3) information supplied in terms of the data maintained in the Social Research Group information system. Staff reports on requests and responses are made at the regular meetings of the Panels.

APPENDIX C

DOCUMENTS PREPARED FOR THE INTERAGENCY PANELS ON EARLY CHILDHOOD AND ADOLESCENCE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

DOCUMENTS PREPARED FOR THE INTERAGENCY PANELS ON EARLY CHILDHOOD AND ADOLESCENCE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT*

Section 1: 1973-1974

Bell, R.Q. & Hertz, T.W. Towards more comparability and generalizability of developmental research. Manuscript submitted for publication, 1974.

Escalona, S.K. Research and service delivery problems concerning the impact of hospitals (including outpatient facilities) on the mental health of young children, March 1973.

Grotberg, E.H. An interagency approach to improved research planning and utilization for Federal agencies of the USA. Courrier, 1974, 24, 117-122.

Grotberg, E.H. (Chair). Panel discussion: Comparability and cross-results analyses in social science research. A series of papers presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, September 1974:

Bell, R.Q. & Hertz, T.W. Societal change and rate of research progress.

Hurt, M., Jr. A progress report on developing comparability in research.

Pearl, D. In furtherance of cumulative knowledge: Some NIMH initiatives.

Grotberg, E.H. (Chair). Panel discussion: The Interagency Panels for Early Childhood Research and Development, and Research and Development On Adolescence. A series of papers presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1974:

Bobbit, J. Rationale and background for the formation of Interagency Panels.

Datta, L. Implications of Panel activities for the research community.

Hurt, M., Jr. Organization and function of the support system for the Interagency Panels.

Pearl, D. Progress report of Interagency Panel activities.

Walker, D. Synopsis of presentations on Interagency Panels.

Harrell, A.V. Working draft: Classification of Federally-funded research in early childhood and adolescence for use with the Panels' information system, June 1974.

Harrell, A.V., Hurt, M., Jr., & Grotberg, E.H. The family: Research considerations and concerns, August 1973.

---

*Listed documents are available from Social Research Group, The George Washington University.

Hertz, T.W., Harrell, A.V., & Grotberg, E.H. Toward interagency coordination: An overview of Federal research and development activities relating to early childhood, third annual report, December 1973.

Hertz, T.W. & Harrell, A.V. Toward interagency coordination: An overview of Federal research and development activities relating to early childhood, fourth annual report, December 1974.

Hertz, T.W., Harrell, A.V., & Hurt, M., Jr. An overview of Federal efforts in research and development in the area of adolescence. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Philadelphia, April 1974.

Hertz, T.W. & Hertz, S.H. (Eds.) Proceedings of the conference on family research, September 1974.

Heyneman, S.P. Adolescence theories and Federal career education programs: Needs and gaps in research (Report on the Adolescence Panel's Special Interest Group on Work Experience, 1973-74), September 1974.

Heyneman, S.P. Toward interagency coordination: An overview of Federal research and development activities relating to adolescence, second annual report, December 1974.

Hurt, M., Jr. An analysis of the comparability potential and information on OCD research projects on the family, December 1974.

Hurt, M., Jr. Child abuse and neglect: A report on the status of research, Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, in press.

Hurt, M., Jr. & Ouellet, R.H. Parenting skills: Comparability study, December 1974.

Searcy, E.O. Work experience as preparation for adulthood: A review of Federal job training, vocational, and career education programs, an analysis of current research, and recommendations for future research, May 1973.

Searcy, E.O., Harrell, A.V., & Grotberg, E.H. Toward interagency coordination: An overview of Federal research and development activities relating to adolescence, first annual report, December 1973.

Social Research Group. Draft of policy guidelines for information release, July 1973.

Social Research Group. Where to send grant, contract, and program proposals, February 1974.

Section 2: 1971-72

Chapman, J. *Early childhood research and development needs, gaps, and imbalances: Overview*, February 1972.

Chapman, J. & Lazar, J. *A review of the present status and future needs in day care research*, November 1971.

Grotberg, E.H. & Searcy, E.O. *A statement and working paper on longitudinal/intervention research*, April 1972.

Grotberg, E.H., Searcy, E.O., & Sowder, B. *Toward interagency coordination: An overview of Federal research and development activities relating to early childhood, second annual report*, November 1972.

Lazar, J. *An analysis of the process of establishing and utilizing research priorities in Federally funded early childhood research and development*, December 1971.

Lazar, J. *Listing of research issues for Panel consideration*, January 1972.

Lazar, J. *The present status and future needs in longitudinal studies in early childhood research and development*, January 1972.

Lazar, J. & Chapman, J. *A review of the present status and future research needs of programs to develop parenting skills*, April 1972.

Lazar, J. & Chapman, J. *Early childhood research and development needs and gaps in Federally funded intervention studies within a longitudinal framework*, March 1972.

Searcy, E.O. *Broad agency goals and agency research objectives for FY '72*, December 1971.

Searcy, E.O. & Chapman, J. *The status of research in children's television*. January 1972.

Searcy, E.O. & Ouellet, R.H. *Legislative mandates for early childhood research*, January 1972.

Searcy, E.O. & Ouellet, R.H. *The history and current status of Federal legislation pertaining to day care programs*, November 1971.

Sowder, B. *An analysis of the longitudinal/intervention research funded by member agencies of the Interagency Panel on Early Childhood Research and Development in FY '72*, December 1972.

Sowder, B. & Lazar, J. *Research problems and issues in the area of socialization*, September 1972.

Stearns, M.S., Searcy, E.O., & Rosenfeld, A.H. *Toward interagency coordination: An overview of Federal research and development activities relating to early childhood and recommendations for the future*, October 1971.

APPENDIX D

ADOLESCENCE PANEL MEMBERSHIP LIST

ADOLESCENCE PANEL MEMBERSHIP LIST*

Mr. Jordan Benderly
Chief, Research & Evaluation
Office of Human Development
HEW North Building, Room 5700
330 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20201
245-7027

Dr. Joseph M. Bobbitt
Assistant Director for Behavioral Sciences
Office of Planning and Evaluation
NICHD
Building 31, Room 2A-22
9000 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
496-1877

Dr. Glen C. Boerrigter
Chief, Vocational Educational Research Program
Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education
Office of Education
ROB No. 3, Room 5012
Seventh and D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20202
245-2468

Dr. Sarah Broman
NINDS
Federal Building, Room 8C-08
7550 Wisconsin Ave.
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
496-5821

Mr. Thomas Burns
Deputy Associate Commissioner
OE/Bureau of School Systems
FOB No. 6, Room 207D
400 Maryland Ave., S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20202
245-8148

Ms. Joan Caton
Office of Education
Office of Legislation
FOB No. 6, Room 4131
400 Maryland Ave., S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20202
245-8280

Mr. William Daniels
OS/ASPE
HEW North Bldg., Room 4552
330 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20201
245-6173

Dr. Lois-ellin Datta
NIE/Career Education Programs
Room 600
Washington, D. C. 20208

Ms. Madeline G. Dowling
SRS/CSA/WIN
Patrick Henry Bldg., Room 5122
601 D Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20210
376-7585

Dr. Sigmund Dragastin
Growth and Development Branch
NICHD
Landow Bldg., Room C-717-B
7910 Woodmont Ave.
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
496-5575

Mr. Donald J. Eberly
Office of Policy and Planning
Policy Development Division
ACTION, Room 606
806 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20525
254-8420

---

*Persons listed here were acting as representatives of their agencies on the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adolescence as of December, 1974. This list is subject to change.

Dr. Ramon Garcia
Office of Child Development
Research and Development Division
Donohoe Building, Room 5723
400 Sixth Street, S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20202
755-7740

Dr. Edith H. Grotberg
Office of Child Development
Donohoe Building, Room 5044
400 Sixth Street, S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20202
755-7750

Mr. Elam K. Hertzler
OE/Special Assistant to the
Commissioner, Room 4177C
400 Maryland Ave., S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20202
245-9248

Dr. Lance Hodes
NIE/Career Education Programs
1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W.
Room 645
Washington, D. C. 20208
254-6057

Ms. Sheila Hollies
NICHD/Program Statistics and
Analysis Branch
Landow Building, Room C-609
7910 Woodmont Ave.
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
496-1971

Mr. Allen Jackson
Office of Management and Budget
New Executive Office Building
Room 7017
17th and Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20503
395-4532

Dr. Paul J. Jehlik
Director, Social Sciences Research
Program
Cooperative State Research Service
Department of Agriculture
Administration Bldg., Room 434-W
Washington, D. C. 20250
447-3768

Dr. James Kavanagh
NICHD/Growth and Development Branch
Landow Building, Room C-716A
7910 Woodmont Ave.
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
496-5575

Ms. Anita King
11451 South Glen Road
Potomac, Maryland 20854
299-4543

Mr. W. Stanley Kruger
OE/Bureau of School Systems
FOB No. 6, Room 2089G
400 Maryland Ave., S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20202
245-8118

Ms. Jane Lampmann
Director of Planning and Evaluation
Office of Human Development
HEW North Bldg., Room 5700
330 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20201
245-7027

Dr. Art Mandakas
HEW/Office of Civil Rights
Government Relations
HEW North Bldg., Room 3457
330 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20201
245-6056

Dr. Hilary Millar
Bureau of Community Health Services
Parklawn Bldg., Room 12A-21
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Maryland 20852
443-4608

Dr. Paul A. Miller
OE/OEEO
FOB No. 6, Room 2181
400 Maryland Ave., S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20202
245-6488

Ms. Julie Phillips
NIMH/Center for Studies of Child
and Family Mental Health
Parklawn Building, Room 12C-24
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Maryland 20852
443-3556

Ms. Lucille Pinkett
Chief, Child Labor Branch
Department of Labor, Room 908
711 Fourteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20210
382-3494

Dr. Merrill S. Read
Acting Associate Director for
Extramural Programs
NICHD/Growth and Development Branch
Landow Bldg., Room C-703
7910 Woodmont Ave.
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
496-5097

Dr. Catherine V. Richards
Office of Youth Development
Donohoe Building, Room 1185
400 Sixth Street, S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20202
245-2841

Dr. Patsy Sampson
NICHD/Growth and Development Branch
Landow Bldg., Room C-717
7910 Woodmont Ave.
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
496-5575

Dr. Alice Y. Scates
OE/OPBE
FOB No. 6, Room 4079
400 Maryland Ave., S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20202
245-8380

Dr. James Spillane
Assistant Director
OE/Office of Drug Education
FOB No. 6, Room 2049
Washington, D. C. 20202
245-7292

Dr. Elsie Tytla
SRS/Medical Services
Administration
Parklawn Bldg., Room 17A-12
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Maryland 20852
443-2631

Ms. Gloria Wackernah
Office of Clinical Services
Division of Health Services
Parklawn Bldg., Room 12A-08
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Maryland 20852
443-2190

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barnett, L.J. Employer based teacher education. The Urban Review, 1972, 541, 36-41.

Brison, D.W. Restructuring the school system. Interchange, 1972, 3, 63-73.

Burnett, H.H. Ceremonies, rites and economy in the student system of the American high school. Human Organization, 1969, 26, 1-10.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Less time, more options. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Cohen, Y.A. Schools in civilized states. In S. Fischer (Ed.), The social sciences and the comparative study of educational systems. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Company, 1970.

Coleman, J.S. The adolescent society. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

Coleman, J.S. The children have outgrown the schools. Psychology Today, 1972, 5, pp. 72-75; 82.

Coleman, J.S. How the young become adults. Review of Education Research, 1972, 42, 431-440.

Coleman, J.S. New incentives for schools. In J.W. Guthrie & E. Wynne (Eds.), New models for American education. Englewood cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Coleman, J.S. The transition from youth to adult. New York University Education Quarterly, 1974, 5, 2-6.

Coleman, J.S., Campbell, E.Q., Hobson, C.J., McPartland, J., Mood, A.M., Weinfeld, F.D., & York, R.L. The equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Feuer, L.F. The conflict of generation: The character and significance of the student movement. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Gartner, A., Kohler, M.C., & Reissman, F. Children teach children: Learning by teaching. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Goodman, P. Growing up absurd. New York: Random House, 1960.

Grinder, R.E. (Ed.). Studies in adolescence. New York: Macmillan, 1963.

Guthrie, J.W. & Wynne, E. (Eds.). New models for American education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Harrell, A.V. Working draft: Classification of Federally-funded research in early childhood and adolescence for use with the Panel's information system. Washington, D.C.: Social Research Group, The George Washington University, June 1974.

Heath, D.H. *Growing up in college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Heyneman, S.P. *The conflict over what is to be learned in school: A history of curriculum politics in Africa*. Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs Monograph, 1971.

Holsinger, D.B. AERA Notes. Discussed at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1974.

Illich, I. *De-schooling society*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Kandel, D.B., & Lesser, G.B. *Youth in two worlds*. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Kiell, N. *The universal experience of adolescence*. New York: International Universities Press, 1964.

Klapp, O.L. *The collective search for identity*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.

LaDuca, A., & Barnett, L.J. Career Education: Program on a white horse. *New York University Education Quarterly*, 1974, *5*, 6-13.

Leet, P. *Socialization, schooling, and society*. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1974.

Macleod, A. *Growing up in America--A background to contemporary drug abuse*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Mental Health, 1973.

McClosky, M., with Kleinbard, P. *Youth into adult: Nine selected youth programs*. New York: The National Commission on Resources for Youth Incorporated, 1974.

National Commission for Reform of Secondary Education. *Reform of secondary education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

The Panel On Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee. *Youth: Transition to adulthood*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

The President's Commission on School Finance. *Schools, people, and money: The need for educational reform*. Washington, D.C.: The President's Commission on School Reform, March 1972.

Reimer, E. *School is dead*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1971.

Report of the White House conference on youth, 1971, Estes Park, Colorado. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Rogers, D. Vocational and career education: A critique and some new directions. *Teachers College Record*, 1973, *74*(4), 471-511.

Searcy, E. *Work experience as preparation for adulthood: A review of Federal job training, vocational, and career education programs, an analysis of current research, and recommendations for future research*. Washington, D.C.: Social Research Group, The George Washington University, May 1973.

Slater, P. The pursuit of loneliness. Boston: Beacon Hill, 1970.

Stuart, P.L. & Cantor, M.G. (Eds.). Varieties of work experience: The social control of occupational groups and roles. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1974.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Management and Budget. Social Indicators, 1973. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

Walker, D. K. Runaway youth: An annotated bibliography and brief literature overview. Prepared for the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, September 1974.